Faith and Sacrament

Arthur Leigh-Lye

265.0239
Class
Book
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York L533
Beside the main topic, this book also treats of

Subject No.	*On page*	*Subject No.*	*On page*

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

FAITH AND SACRAMENT;

OR,

THE TRUE KEY TO HOLY LIVING.

Sacraments

Faith and Sacrament;

OR,

THE TRUE KEY TO HOLY LIVING.

d 1916?

BY

ARTHUR LEIGH-LYE, B.A.,

Vicar of Kings Pyon, Herefordshire.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

LONDON:

SKEFFINGTON & SON,

34, SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.,

PUBLISHERS TO HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

1903.

265.0230
L533

36707

.66

GEN. THEO. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

TO

THE RIGHT REVEREND

JOHN PERCIVAL, D.D.,

LORD BISHOP OF HEREFORD,

THE FOLLOWING PAGES ARE RESPECTFULLY

DEDICATED,

AS A TOKEN OF REVERENCE AND AFFECTION.

PREFACE.

THE teaching of the Church of England as expressed in its formularies, has resulted in impressing upon the minds of most of its members, the supreme importance of regarding God's Word written, as the only ultimate source of Divine light, whence the pure and undefiled truth of God may be drawn.

In this respect it is in entire harmony with the Church in primitive times, which never ceased to assert the supremacy of Holy Scripture as the sole standard of authority by which all controversies must be settled. Witness, for instance, Nicæa and Athanasius—one the greatest of Councils, the other, perhaps, the greatest of Theologians. The evidence of history is decisive that at Nicæa both parties accepted Holy Scripture as the final test of truth. Athanasius, for what he believed to be its true and essential meaning, was content to stand alone in solitary protest, rejected of Christendom—"Athanasius contra mundum."

Moreover, it has been the decisiveness of this testimony concerning the Bible as the primary source of faith and practice, which has increasingly taught the English people to value their Book of Common Prayer,

as a real digest of the Word of God and a true guide to faith and conduct, combining in every part such delicacy of composition and such a sweet savour of holiness, as makes it one of the most precious heritages of an Englishman.

Strange, however, that a book so universally esteemed, as is the Book of Common Prayer, should be the Book of departure—that those who profess to use it, so often forthwith depart from it, either on the one side or the other.

Stranger still, that a book drawn up by men saturated with Bible truth, (the Compilers were the great Translators, and for that which they set forth in this book were ready even to lay down their lives, and in many cases did so, clasping it in the very flames) should be looked upon by many as a mere compromise, often dumb, or speaking only with a stammering tongue, or merely as a Liturgy Popish, with Articles steeped in Anti-Popery.

Yet of this very book, multitudes of humble and simple folk have learnt the real unity, the deep spirituality; and have found it, next to the Bible, their greatest helper and teacher, saving them from a life of endless interrogation, and making it instead one of rogation to our Heavenly Father.

To all such, the author, or perhaps I ought to say the compiler of this work, for some of its paragraphs are copied bodily from a common-place book, desires to offer this fruit of his labours, hoping that this setting forth of Bible and Prayer Book teaching may

prove helpful, by showing that the Faith of the Gospel is both definite and yet broad—a Faith that may be held in calm certainty to the end, because ever leaving ample room for the soul's growth amid all the changing experiences of life.

ARTHUR LEIGH-LYE.

Kings Pyon Vicarage,
Herefordshire,
April 14th, 1903.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I. PAGE

THE BIBLE REVELATION CONCERNING GOD AND MAN 1

SECTION I.—OF GOD.

Scripture the sole depository of Divine knowledge.
The Creeds in relation to Scripture.
God fully revealed in and through Christ.
This revelation constitutes the Catholic Faith.
The Catholic Faith is expressed in a life of Worship.
The life of Worship a life of (*a*) fellowship with God;
(*b*) service of God.

NOTE.—On the importance of one's faith being firm and definite. (Extracts from the writings of the late Bishop Phillips Brooks.)

SECTION II.—OF MAN.

Bible teaching concerning man.
God's purposes not frustrated by the Fall.
Everything will reach its predestined end.

CHAPTER II.

GOD'S DEALINGS WITH MAN 24

SECTION I.—A COVENANT GOD.

A Covenant defined.
A Covenant and man's individuality.
A Covenant and God's universal purpose.

SECTION II.—THE OLD COVENANT. PAGE

Its Terms.
Its Sacraments: (*a*) Circumcision;
(*b*) The Passover.

SECTION III.—THE NEW COVENANT.

Its Terms.
Its Characteristics: (*a*) Obedience;
(*b*) Knowledge;
(*c*) Forgiveness.
Its Sacraments: (*a*) Baptism;
(*b*) The Lord's Supper.

SECTION IV.—THE PRIVILEGES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF LIVING UNDER THE NEW COVENANT.

(A brief consideration of Hebrews xii. 18-29.)

SECTION V.—COVENANT STANDING THE BASIS OF ALL TRUE EDUCATION.

The teaching of (*a*) Jewish children.
(*b*) Christian children.

CHAPTER III.

THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM 52

SECTION I.—THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM.

The testimony of Scripture concerning Baptism.
How Baptism embraces all life (infant and adult), and life as a whole (its beginning, its ending, and all its various stages).

SECTION II.—THE PRAYER BOOK SERVICE FOR THE PUBLIC BAPTISM OF INFANTS.

SECTION III.—BAPTISMAL REGENERATION (AN HISTORICAL NOTE).

SECTION IV.—DIVINE GRACE.

SECTION V.—INFANT BAPTISM.

Contents.

CHAPTER IV. PAGE

THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER... ... 97

SECTION I.—THE LORD'S SUPPER ACCORDING TO SCRIPTURE.

(*a*) The Words of Institution.
(*b*) St. John vi. 26-64.
(*c*) The Doctrine of St. Paul.
Of the relation of the Bread and Wine to the Eucharistic Gift.
How the teaching of St. John is set forth in the Eucharist.

SECTION II.—THE SACRIFICIAL CHARACTER OF THE EUCHARIST.

Sacrifice according to the early Church.
Doctrinal changes made at the Reformation.
One only Propitiatory Sacrifice.
The Sacrifices of the Levitical System of two kinds :
(*a*) Propitiation ;
(*b*) Righteousness.
Sacrifices of Righteousness obligatory.
References to Sacrifices of Righteousness in the Prayer Book Communion Service.

SECTION III.—THE ADORATION OF CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST.

Prayer Book treatment of this question.

SECTION IV.—THE ORDER FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, OR HOLY COMMUNION.

SECTION V.—THE CHURCH CATHOLIC AND THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE.

The Teaching of (*a*) Unreformed Christendom.
(*b*) The Churches of the Reformation.

SECTION VI.—THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE ACCORDING TO ROME, AND THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

NOTE.—Bishop Gore on the Eucharist.

Faith and Sacrament.

CHAPTER I.

The Bible Revelation Concerning God and Man.

Section I.

OF GOD.

A.

MOST Christians agree that the knowledge of true Christianity is derived from one source—Apostolic Tradition, *i.e.*, the revelation of God as handed down through the Apostles, whether in writing or orally (2 Thess. ii. 15).

To this place of pre-eminence the Church of England assigns the written word of God alone, because it is the only Apostolical tradition extant

upon which she can rely as such. The Bible is therefore with her the one only Rule of Faith.[1]

It is not, however, because Scripture is a writing that we make it the only Rule of Faith, for if any oral tradition could be proved to be undoubtedly Apostolic, we should receive it equally with Scripture, but because no such Apostolic tradition can be produced. The oral teaching of the Apostles, if they taught anything besides or beyond what we have in Scripture, has perished irretrievably, as have the many discourses and miracles which our Lord spoke and performed and which have not been recorded (St. John xxi. 25).

We believe, of course, that they did not teach anything substantially different from or beyond what the Scriptures contain.[2]

But while Holy Scripture is the one only *Rule*

[1] Compare the Questions in the Prayer-book Services for "The Consecration of Bishops" and "The Ordering of Priests" with the Questions in the Sarum Pontifical—how wholly different is the position assigned to Scripture since the Reformation! See also Article 6.

[2] "There is no foundation whatever for the alleged existence of those Divine and Apostolic Traditions which are made to constitute an unwritten Word or Tradition, as a Rule of Faith. The Church of England, therefore, acted wisely in rejecting that Rule; and when we further consider the consequences of that rejection, we may well assert that the rejection of Tradition, as a Rule of Faith, was the vital principle of the Reformation" (Bishop Marsh, "Comparative View," page 74. 1814).

of Faith, the Creeds are the *Rule of Communion*, because they are concentrated summaries of Apostolic teaching, setting forth the common faith of Christendom from the earliest times. The authority of the Creeds, however, as regards our submission to them, depends on the degree in which they are accurately collected from the Word of God, and rightly exhibit the most essential elements of Apostolic teaching; but when proved to be true summaries of the faith of the Gospel, they are of special use and importance, as showing how few and practical were the truths required in earlier times to be believed as necessary terms of Christian communion. "The three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Anthanasius' Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed," our 8th Article says, "ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture."

It would seem that those truths, which were considered the essentials of Christian faith, assumed almost from the beginning some definite outline, although there is no mention of any universal Creed until the times of Nicæa (A.D. 325). All Christians by their profession alike acknowledged Jesus as Lord, and were committed to the baptismal formula (St. Matt. xxviii. 19; Acts viii. 12), and the Creeds at the first were little more than

simple statements of belief, (i.) in God—setting forth the full revelation of that Name into which all are baptized; and, (ii.) in Christ Jesus, "the Sent" of the Father—embodying more or less completely the facts concerning Him, His Incarnation, His Virgin-Birth, His Death and Resurrection, His Ascension and Session at God's right hand, the sending of the Holy Spirit, and the expectation that "He shall come again."

As time went on, however, several negations were put forth tending to deny, or at least to circumscribe, the truths contained in the various baptismal Creeds, and this convinced the Christian brotherhood of the necessity of putting forth a common statement of the common faith, in order to place its true meaning beyond all question, as well as to preserve it unimpaired from all such limitating notions. Hence it is that we have inherited, in addition to the simple baptismal Creed, "commonly called the Apostles' Creed," the Nicene Creed, which sets forth definitely the meaning which is to be attached to certain statements in the Apostles' Creed, and also "the Creed of Athanasius," used on the great festivals, the Creed of Worship, the survival probably of a very ancient hymn.

And all these three Creeds set forth the universal Christian Faith as no other than a belief in the Being of God, the Tri-Une God, and in the

redeeming love of the Incarnate Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.

Thus the Faith, as expressed in the longest and fullest of the Creeds—the Athanasian—is summed up in two clauses (vv. 3 and 28), one referring to the Blessed Trinity, and the other to our Lord Jesus Christ.

"Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith . . . and the Catholic Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity" (v. 3).

"Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation: that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right Faith is, that we believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man" (v. 28).

"This is life eternal," said our Lord, "that they should know Thee, the only true God, and Him Whom Thou didst send, even Jesus Christ" (St. John xvii. 3). And the Church is in duty bound to require a full statement of belief in God and in Christ, as the requisite terms of communion, but she has no right to say that any other truth is necessary to eternal life. Certainly the Church of England knows no other Faith as "necessary to everlasting salvation." In her case there is no straining the cords of assent; every Englishman,

whatever theories he may hold, if he truly professes this faith in God, and in the incarnate Son Jesus Christ, has a full right to all the privileges of membership in her communion.[1]

B.

It has been well said that while God is utterly inscrutable in Himself, and His Essence, yet at the same time He is scrutable through His utterances, *i.e.*, through the outerance of Himself which He is continually making in the world around me and in my own mind within me. But here an objection arises; "the reason of man," it is answered, "is incompetent to know God, because reason is finite, and the finite cannot embrace the infinite." But is it true that we can know nothing unless we have a perfect knowledge? Does *ap*prehension involve *com*prehension? I may "know" something of Plato, though totally incompetent to sound the depths of his mind. The finite truly

[1] How terribly the Church of Rome has departed from the Catholic Faith in the way of additions! What a number of novel doctrines are declared by Rome as essentials to membership in her communion! But it may be asked, Has not the Church of England besides the three Creeds, 39 Articles of Religion? Yes, but these are not all necessary terms of communion. They are Articles of Religion imposed not on all the members of our Church, but principally on the Clergy, because setting forth the mind of the Church of England concerning many truths taught in Holy Scripture.

cannot *comprehend* the infinite, cannot, literally, hold it within its grasp; but the finite can apprehend such manifestations of the infinite as come within this grasp. "Though we cannot know God by intuition and direct beholding, we can and do know Him by those rays which are reflected on us by the facts of nature and mind. The more we learn of the works and ways of God, the more do do we know, not indeed God in His Essence, but God in His Character in relation to ourselves."[1]

Now in the Apostolical writings, how enlarged, how altogether new, are the relations which open out upon us, as existing between God and ourselves. It is not the God of nature merely, or the God of the Old Testament only, it is an unveiling of God in the face of Jesus Christ—it is a knowledge of God as our Father, our Redeemer, our Sanctifier, it is God in Christ, that is, in such a form and in such relation to us as He nowhere else, and could by no other means be so made known. "No man hath seen God at any time" (*i.e.*, no one has gained an adequate conception of God's character), "the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him" (*i.e.*, made Him clearly known) (St. John i. 18).

"All things have been delivered unto Me of My Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the

[1] See "Fundamentals," by Thomas Griffith, page 120.

Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and He to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him" (St. Matt. xi. 27).

"We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life. My little children, guard yourselves from idols," (*i.e.*, there can be no true and adequate conception of God apart from Christ, only through Him is there a perfect knowledge. He, and He alone, is the perfect manifestation of the Most High. Keep yourselves, therefore, from all false conceptions of God, they are but "idols") (1 St. John v. 20, 21).

How unceasingly did our Lord reveal God by making His own human character known to His Disciples! In every action and in every word of His, He was always bidding them gaze on the face of God. "I manifested Thy Name unto the men whom Thou gavest Me out of the world" (St. John xvii. 6). "Have I been so long time with you, and dost thou not know Me, Philip? he that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father" (St. John xiv. 9). He was always occupied in drawing them to the Father, assuring them of His own oneness with the Father, as the Divine Son. He was always teaching them that herein was

their safety and their life. He gave them many pre-intimations of the gift of the one Spirit of the Father and of the Son, Who would be to them "another Comforter" (one like Himself, compare St. John xiv. 16 with 1 St. John ii. 1). And then, when they were prepared for the full discovery, He revealed the Holy Name, in which we stand and by which we live, bidding His disciples go and baptize men of all nations "into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (St. Matt. xxviii. 19).

But how shall man secure to himself this great and inestimable privilege, this high and holy confidence, this all-sufficient resource in that ever-blessed Name?

The Church answers, by Worship, the Catholic Faith is no subtility of thought nor disquisition, to which the higher intellects might aspire, and which more ordinary persons might foolishly imitate; indeed all such mental operations are forbidden to man. The Catholic Faith is the worship of the one God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and of the Lord Jesus Christ, God and Man, Who lived and died and rose again, and Who now ever lives for us. And this worship can be expressed only in a life of fellowship and service.[1]

[1] The full force of this truth has been somewhat obliterated by unfortunate alterations made in our formularies by the Revisers

1. Fellowship with God.

St. Paul declares that through Christ we have access by one Spirit unto the Father: all barriers are broken down, and we are no longer outcasts, but children, who can say, "the Father's dwelling-place is our true home." The Apostle's words are:—"For through Him we both (*i.e.*, Jews and Gentiles) have our access in one Spirit unto the Father. So then ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God" (Eph. ii. 18, 19).

And St. John exclaims, "That which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us: yea, and our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ: and these things we write that our joy may be fulfilled" (1 St. John i. 3, 4).

Now it is in Christian prayer and praise that we claim our possession and enter into the enjoyment of this grace. For what is Christian prayer? Is it not confidence in God's relation to us, the approaching Him as our Father? It has been well said that our Lord never used throughout

of 1662. For instance, the Collect for Trinity Sunday as it left the hands of the first Compilers of our Liturgy, laid all the stress on the moral rather than on the intellectual keeping of the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity.

His teaching (except in quotation) the name which had distinguished the God of Israel—"Jehovah," but substituted for it a new name to be equally distinctive of the God of Christians—"Father." Hence it is that the Spirit which distinguishes this dispensation from every other is called emphatically the Spirit, not of bondage, to inspire us with fear, but of adoptive boldness to cry out in us loudly, "Father."

Moreover, we must ask in Christ's Name, for all God's gifts come down through the same channel by which alone prayer ascends: "If ye shall ask anything of the Father," says Christ, "He will give it you in My Name . . . ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be fulfilled" (St. John xvi. 23, 24). And this approaching the Father through the Son no more gives us any strain or tension of thought, than when having spoken to our Lord Jesus Christ, we are called upon suddenly, as in our Prayer-book Litany, to speak to the Father, or conversely. For there is no speculation, no question of how to adjust our various thoughts and prayers to each other. It is a matter of the heart, and when the heart is true, and humble, and reverent, there is no difficulty. Simply because we are praying to the one God, we name Each severally. We confess Each severally to be God, because the Father and the Son are One in the unity of the One

Spirit, and there is not, and there never can be, separation or division in Him, or in the heart's approach to Him. Thus by prayer we enter into fellowship with God—praying to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, or praying to the Father, through the Son, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost.

And what is Christian praise? Is it not the earthly echo of the ceaseless song of Heaven? When Isaiah foresaw the new and living way to God opened through Christ (with Isa. vi. compare St. John xii. 37-41), he heard the Seraphim cry, "Holy, Holy, Holy," that same song which the Apostle of Love heard the living creatures (Cherubim) utter, when he beheld the Beatific vision of God's Face (Rev. iv. 2-8). And since through Christ we are no longer outcasts, but very citizens of Heaven, the Church takes up her stand within the rent veil, and joins with angels and all the company of Heaven in that self-same song—the unwearied adoration of the great mystery of Trinity in Unity. What higher note can man utter than one of confidence and trust in God's nature and character, as revealed in His Son?

Oh, for a heart tuned to the melody of Heaven—a heart which beats with a trine pulsation of love to the Father, the Fountain, as of pity, so of grace—and to the sole-begotten Son, the channel

whence mercy ever flows, and to the Holy Spirit, Who alone imparts all blessings to the soul.

2. Service of God.

But if we are to make secure our safety and our confidence in the Divine Name, we must needs seek to act upon the truth contained in it. We need to go to our duties and difficulties under its shelter. And here again our thoughts are compelled to distinguish between our service towards the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, although there can be no separation between these acts of service; all run into each other and blend in one. We need to act and believe as children of our Heavenly Father. We need to act and believe as those who belong to the Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. We need to act and believe as those who are animated and inspired and possessed by the Holy Ghost. Our lives ought to be fashioned after the example of the first Christian martyr, St. Stephen, of whom we read, "he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven and saw the glory of God and Jesus standing on the right hand of God" (Acts vii. 55). What difficulties and dangers at that moment surrounded his path! How was continuous effort at such a moment possible? One thing enabled him to triumph over

every fear—"he looked up steadfastly into heaven and saw the glory of God."

In our life of service, however dark may be the cloud that overshadows us, the Master's voice may be heard saying, "If thou believest, thou shalt see the glory of God." Oh, to live and act ever as children under a Father's eye—to recognise that all we are called upon to do or to bear, comes directly from His hand, the appointed pathway along which we must walk—love's predestined means for our growth in holiness.

Stephen "saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing"—saw his Saviour, One Who ever liveth for His people, marking their weary marches, leading them by ways that they know not, and saving them to the uttermost—Him he saw standing by the throne, ready to succour and defend His servant in his hour of need.

But how was Stephen thus enabled to see all this?—"He, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up . . ."

That great gift, which our Heavenly Father is so infinitely ready to bestow upon us all (St. Luke xi. 11-13), so penetrated, pervaded, and upheld him, that he was lifted up above all things happening around, and enabled to triumph over them—"they gnashed on him with their teeth"—"ran upon him with one accord"—"cast him out"—

"stoned him." "But he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up," etc.

"Grant, O Lord, in all our service here below, we may steadfastly look up and see by faith Thy glory, and Jesus standing at Thy right hand, and being filled with the Holy Ghost, may ever be obedient to the heavenly vision."

NOTE.—ON KEEPING THE FAITH.[1]

By the Late Bishop Phillips Brooks.

"Some people seem to think that it is bad for any man to have definitely accepted a religious belief, in which he proposes to live and die, which he never expects to change. It is the loose popular feeling against creeds. 'Have your creeds,' says, in substance, one of our teachers, 'if you must, but build them like birds' nests, to be used only this year.' Such a feeling would make it disreputable for any man to say, more than one year hence, 'I have kept the faith.' To say it at the close of a lifetime, for all the life, would prove the man to be either insincere or blindly stupid. It is the violent protest against the deadness of traditional religion, which would substitute for it the galvanic life of ever-altering whim. . . . Surely such a teaching utterly unfits the mind for the noble search after an absolute truth, making it believe either that there is no such thing, or else that it is unattainable by man. Surely it must reject the whole idea of a revelation from God to man. Surely it must break away the solid ground on which alone men can stand to do their work for God or fellowman. For, feel as we may how blindly men have often chosen their beliefs, and how ignorantly they have clung to them, still we must see that only from the strong footing of some truth which they believed, and deemed unchangeable, only

[1] See "Sermons preached in Boston and Philadelphia." Publisher, Dickinson, London.

from the solid ground of some clear creed, have men done good strong work in the world. Strong action can issue only from strong faith. Only out of certainty comes power. I do not think that men consider how much of all that is dearest to them about God and themselves and fellowman they must abandon, unless they can believe that it is possible and profitable to come with the best light they have to some conclusion, which shall be certainty to them, and then to count that settled; to keep that faith; not to be for ever pulling up and examining that root-power of their lives, but, with the best cultivation they can give it, to make it blossom into every grace, and ripen into every fruit of good activity which it is capable of bearing" (pages 67, 68).

"What sort of a creed may one hold, and expect to hold it always, live in it, die in it, and carry it even to the life beyond? In the first place, it must be a creed broad enough to allow the man to grow within it, to contain and to supply his ever-developing mind and character. It will not be a creed burdened with many details. It will consist of large truths and principles, capable of ever-varying applications to ever-varying life" (page 70).

"And the second characteristic of the faith that can be kept will be its evidence, its proved truth. It will not be a mere aggregation of chance opinions. . . . We do not properly believe what we only think. A thousand speculations come into our heads, and our minds dwell upon them, which are not to be, therefore put into our creed, however plausible they seem. Our creed, anything which we call by such a sacred name, is not what we have thought, but what our Lord has told us. The true creed must come down from above, and not out from within. Have your opinions always, but do not bind yourself to them. Call your opinions your creed, and you will change it every week. Make your creed simply and broadly out of the revelation of God, and you may keep it to the end. This is the difference between the hundreds of long, detailed confessions of many

differing sects, overloaded with the minute speculations of good men . . . and the short scriptural creed of the Church universal, into which souls come seeking rest and strength, and live in it as in a home, and go no more out forever" (pages 71, 72).

"And then the third quality of a creed that a man may keep up to the end is that it is a creed capable of being turned into action. A mere speculation, however true it be, I think you never can be sure that the mind will hold. The faith which you keep must be a faith that demands obedience, and you can keep it only by obeying it. Are not both of these true? Those parts of religion which are purely speculative, if, indeed, such mere speculation is part of religion at all, are the parts in which men most often and most easily change. A hundred men change their views of abstract truth for one who alters his conviction of practical duty. The one may be changed and nothing suffers; a change in the other alters the whole life. Look at two men holding the same truth—the truth of the Trinity, for instance. To one it presents itself always as a doctrine to be learned, to the other as a law to be obeyed. One's view of it is always theoretical, the other's always practical. They both believe it, but one asserts it, demonstrates it, reasons about it. The other lives by it. Which is the true believer? I can conceive of the first man losing his belief, and yet going on much the same. Convince him with a specious argument, and he will let it drop, and, except that he talks of it no longer, nobody will know the difference. But take the truth of the Divine Father, the Divine Saviour, the Divine Comforter, out of the other's life, and all is gone. Duty no longer has a zest, nor prayer an object, nor grief a consolation. The whole life falls to pieces when its truth is gone" (pages 72, 73).

"When you find a man of eighty professing to believe still what he believed at twenty, it may signify something very bad or very good. It may mean death or life. It may mean that long ago he gave up thinking and studying and feeling, and is

going along through life, and by and by is going out of life, to God, with nothing but an old withered handful of grass and flowers, dead long since, which he still thinks precious, because they were fresh and live when he picked them sixty years ago. But he has held them in his hands, instead of planting them into his life, and they are dead. He goes, saying, 'I have kept the faith,' but he has no more kept it than the tomb that keeps the body keeps the man. But there is another old man who believes still his boyhood's creed. The things that were so dear to him at first have grown dearer, year by year. The joy and grief of life, like sunshine and rain, have worked together to ripen the well planted field. He said the creed this morning, and it was truer to him than on the day when he was confirmed. All life has illustrated it, and now, as death draws near, he sees how, through death's window, eternity casts into it light and meaning that it never had before. He will go, saying, 'I have kept the faith,' and hold it up really still green and vigorous before God. . . . Such be our constant saying of our creed, our steadfast keeping of the faith" (pages 75, 76).

Section II.

OF MAN.

To rightly understand the Bible story of creation we must first clearly grasp the fact that it was written with the object of telling us what man is, and not what Adam was.

It was requisite, for the after unfolding of God's purposes, that man should have some knowledge of his relation to his Maker, and his connection with nature, animate and inanimate; and also how he has fallen out of right relation to God and

to all things; hence the reference to a first man.[1]

Nothing is more certain than that man's connection with nature is an abiding reality, and that the duties involved in it are of permanent obligation—so, too, man's connection with God, and all that is involved in that relationship is equally real and indissoluble.[2]

Now the Bible everywhere asserts that man as man:—

1. Participates in the likeness of God.
2. Is capable of intercourse with God.
3. And that the chief end of his existence is to glorify God.

[1] "The Bible everywhere takes for granted 'the Fall' as one of the most significant facts relating to man; this it does, not so much in the way of abstract argument, but in historic records, national and individual, showing how sin once let in acts and works. In traditional orthodox theology sin in its extent is characterised as 'total depravity,' or 'the corruption of our whole nature.' This does not mean that every individual is as bad as he can be, which would be transparently absurd, but that the depravity which sin has produced in human nature extends to the whole of it. There is no part of man's nature which is unaffected by it . . . man's nature is all of a piece, and that which affects it at all affects it altogether. When the conscience is violated by disobedience to the will of God, the moral understanding is darkened, and the will enfeebled" ("Studies in Theology," Denney, page 83).

[2] "We are in an order, relations abide whether we be faithful to them or neglect them. And the conscience in each of us affirms, 'I am in this order, I ought to act consistently with it, let my fancies say what they will'" (F. D. Maurice on the "Conscience," page 57).

1. The participation in the likeness of God is declared to have continued on from Adam to his posterity, notwithstanding the moral degradation of "the Fall" (Gen. v. 3). Hence the prohibition against killing man (for food, as the context implies) is based on the peculiarity that man has in him something similar to God, and that this similarity is transmitted from generation to generation (Gen. ix. 5, 6).

Again this image is recognised by St. Paul as extant in the men of his own time, for he rears on it an argument to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xi. 7). And the presence of this image is referred to by St. James as enhancing the guilt of unbrotherly anger (St. James iii. 9). Plainly, therefore, this image, being one of the essential characteristics of human nature, is as permanent as the race itself.[1]

[1] "In Christ Jesus the true type of our nature is embodied and realised. The image of God shines forth in all its purity in the Son of God. In Him we see our nature as it was formed to be. And His whole work, from first to last, has for its end to redeem us out of our abnormal condition into harmony with this high destiny. . . . If, then, we would become in fact what we are in faculty, if we would attain in character what we were made for in capacity, Christ must be formed in us! So shall the mists which darken us be dispersed, so shall our minds, through all their powers, become irradiated. The image of our Father shall beam forth from within us like a lamp through a crystal vase, and we shall shine as lights in the world" (See "Sermons for the Times," by Thomas Griffith, page 21).

2. Man is capable of intercourse with God. To speak of God as answering to the truest and deepest needs and yearnings of the human heart, without such a capacity on man's part, would be meaningless. The whole work of divine Grace, from the faintest drawings of God the Holy Ghost, up to the fullest indwelling in the human heart, is rendered possible by this affinity of the human spirit with the Divine, and its consequent susceptibility to calls from God and communion with God: "For though," as Archbishop Leighton says, "we have fallen from communion with our Maker, from all right to it, from the right desire of it, yet not from a capacity for it,[1] no, nor from a necessity of it for the answering and filling of our capacity."

3. Man is made for the glory of God. Nothing is more certain than that God's purposes will, in the end, be accomplished; and it is in the accomplishment of His will that His own glory and the happiness of His creatures blend together as one and the same thing. God's glory is like His essence, "love"; He orders all things for

[1] "The Bible speaks of man, as a rule, not in his relation to nature, but in his distinction from it. It assumes that the life which is in him, with that reflecting consciousness, that sense of freedom and responsibility, that affinity to, and capacity for, the divine, is specifically distinct from life in any other form" ("Studies in Theology," Denney, page 75).

His creatures' good, this alone constitutes His glory. "The glory of God, that is, the reflection of His own perfections in all that exists, though now veiled in so many respects, will one day shine forth magnificently and perfectly throughout the entire universe. For," as Hodge says, "the highest end for which all things can exist and be ordered is to display the character of God. This goal of history is anticipated, as it were, by the wish and prayer of the Apostle, 'To Him be glory!'" (Rom. xi. 36, see Godet).

Accordingly, if the Bible bids man look backward to his original calling and what he once was, it is in order that he may eagerly desire, and look forward to, a final restoration. The Divine heart wills, so the Bible declares, to bind all things together and to Himself (to Himself, and therefore together), thus to transform the earth and to bring in everlasting righteousness; whence we have the magnificent expectations of the sacred writings, and the glorious visions of the Apocalyptic Seer: "New heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness," "The Holy City, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of Heaven . . . the tabernacle of God is with men, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes: and there shall be no more death,

neither sorrow, nor crying, for the former things are passed away"; "Then cometh the end, when He shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power" (2 Peter iii. 13; Rev. xxi. 2-4; Rom. viii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 24).

God's purpose for all creation shall then have reached its consummation, everything shall utter His glory, and He Himself shall be all in all.

"Hallelujah; for the Lord our God, the Almighty, reigneth. Let us rejoice and be exceeding glad, and let us give the glory unto Him" (Rev. xix. 6, 7).

CHAPTER II.

God's Dealings with Man.

Section I.

A COVENANT GOD.

HOLY Scripture sets forth God's revelation of Himself to man, as having been made to assume the form of a Covenant, at least since the days of Abraham. The records of the antediluvian world are very brief and do not supply detailed and unambiguous information upon this point. It is indeed recorded that at a very early period "men began to call upon the name of the Lord" (Gen. iv. 26), and a distinction is marked between "the sons of God" and "the daughters of men" (Gen. vi. 4), but we are not instructed in the precise nature of that distinction, or in what manner God at that time revealed Himself to man.

But from the days of Abraham, and onwards, the case is plain. God's revelation of Himself

has been cast in the form of a Covenant. When, however, we speak of a Covenant of God, we must not think of an agreement, the terms of which are binding because settled by mutual consent, for there never could have been any bargaining between God and man. Every divine Covenant is of necessity entirely of God's own making. If you examine any of these Covenants, you cannot fail to observe that they are gratuitous and spontaneous engagements into which God of His own will has been pleased to enter with the children of men. By the word Covenant in its divine sense we must understand therefore:

A definite disclosure of God's purpose, by which He is prepared to stand and to be bound—or perhaps better, an agreement which binds the Almighty to a certain course of conduct, not because men have arranged the terms with Him, but because He, in His infinite wisdom, love and mercy, has willed them and announced them to man.

Now Holy Scripture sets forth God's object in thus entering into Covenant with man as twofold:

(1) In order to afford greater assurance to man.

(2) To bring men into fellowship one with another.

No Covenant of course can alter God, or in any way change His essential nature. God is true,

and will of necessity, fulfil His own promise. (1) The Covenant was to give strong consolation and assurance to man that God's word must be accomplished. It was intended to awaken in man an unwavering expectation that every word that God had said would be fulfilled to him. It was to draw man to God Himself in personal dependence and humble waiting for that fulfilment. It was to stir him up to come boldly to the throne of grace, and not only ask, but claim a Covenant right, to all that had been promised.

But God is essentially a God of gracious fellowship, and His purpose has to do not merely with the individual, but (2) with man in fellowship with his fellow-man. In Scripture God's Covenants are intimately connected with an all-embracing purpose concerning the world at large; a purpose which we find gradually unfolded, by means of Covenant relationship, from a sacred family in Abraham, through a sacred nation in Moses, to a sacred universal brotherhood in Christ Jesus.

Thus Scripture plainly declares that it was not for the mere personal benefit of the individual that God called Abraham out of the darkness of heathenism, and illuminated him with the knowledge of Himself, but that he might become the founder of a family in which this knowledge

might be preserved, increased, and extended from age to age. "The Lord said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto the land that I will show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation . . . and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (Gen. xii. 1-3). Moreover God said . . . "Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him. For I have known him, to the end that he may command his children and his household after him, that they may keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; to the end that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which He hath spoken of him" (Gen. xviii. 18, 19). Observe well that it is here expressly declared that God called Abraham in order that he might teach others the true nature of God, and particularly those moral foundations of all true religion, justice and equity; that is, the law of right and the law of recompense.

The next unfolding of the divine purpose was the constitution, in the descendants of Abraham, of a sacred nation, which in its turn became the depositary and diffuser of the divine light and life. For when Abraham's family had swollen into tribes, and the tribes into an Abrahamic race,

God raised up His servant Moses to consecrate these inheritors of the primary blessing to the sacred office of preserving, enlarging, and communicating the fundamental principles of true religion. "Ye have seen what I did," says God, "unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto Myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey My voice indeed, and keep My Covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me from among all peoples: for all the earth is Mine: and ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation" (Exodus xix. 4, 5, 6). And so Moses called unto all Israel and said unto them, "Hear, O Israel, the statutes and the judgments which I speak in your ears this day, that ye may learn them, and observe to do them" (Deut. v. 1).

Whence St. Paul considers the crowning glory of Israel to have been that they were made depositaries of divine truth. "What advantage, then, hath the Jew?" *(i.e.*, what superiority over the other nations?) . . . "first of all, that they were intrusted with the oracles of God" *(i.e.*, the divine communications of old time) (Rom. iii. 1).

Nor were they to be only the depositaries, they were to be also the diffusers of the divine knowlege entrusted to them. They were not only to teach their sons and their son's sons in lineal suc-

cession through the historic life of the nation, but they were to fulfil the promise made to Abraham by spreading this knowledge beyond the confines of their national life, so as to gather in others to share in their privileges.

> "God be merciful unto us, and bless us,
> And cause His face to shine upon us;
> That Thy way may be known upon earth,
> Thy saving health among all nations."
>
> (Psalm lxvii. 1, 2.)

And thus at length the purposes of God became fully unfolded, and the divine Word first made known to an individual, and, spread by means of a sacred family through a sacred nation, became, in and through Christ, enshrined in a sacred universal brotherhood, destined to consist of individuals of all nations.

"This Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations; and then shall the end come" (St. Matt. xxiv. 14). "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations" (St. Matt. xxviii. 19). ". . . my Gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ . . . is made known unto all the nations unto obedience of faith" (Rom. xvi. 25, 26).

Section II.

GOD'S DEALINGS WITH MAN UNDER THE OLD COVENANT.

The Covenant which gives its name to the first great division of the Bible, and the true root out of which all the earlier Scriptures have grown, is the old Covenant[1]—that is, the Covenant which God made with Abraham.

God said to Abraham, "I will establish My Covenant between Me and thee, and thy seed after thee . . . to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land of thy sojournings, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God" (Gen. xvii. 7, 8).

Here, combined with the promise of an inheritance for "an everlasting possession," is the promise—"I will be their God." How much is contained in this glorious promise! For it certainly implies nothing less than, "I am thine, so

[1] It is worthy of notice that the Greek word for Covenant and Testament is one and the same, and except in Heb. ix. 16 and 17, the Revised Version everywhere uses Covenant. Thus the Old Testament is referred to as the Book of the Old Covenant. ". . . for until this very day at the reading of the Old Covenant the same veil remaineth unlifted" (2 Cor. iii. 14).

far as is requisite for thy support, protection, and endless happiness." Nor must we so limit this promise as if its fulfilment had reference to man in one part of his being, the soul, rather than to man in the totality of his nature. God is the Creator and Redeemer of man, of the spirit, soul and body of man (1 Thess. v. 23); of man as man, in order that every part of man's nature may utter His glory. When, therefore, God promises to be the God of a man, the salvation of that man, in the full entirety of his being, is all-essential to a true and adequate fulfilment of the promise. Our Lord has told us that this promise, "I will be their God," is a sufficient foundation whereon to rest peacefully under any circumstance; that it is a pledge of immortality, and a true warrant for faith in a resurrection (St. Matt. xxii. 31, 32). Verily this promise may be said to be the crown and consummation of every blessing! "God is not ashamed of them, to be called their God: for He hath prepared for them a city" (Heb. xi. 16).

It may be remarked that not a word is said in the actual terms of the Covenant as regards obedience, the reason being that it was essentially a Covenant of Grace and Mercy, in which relationship to Jehovah was the true source and ground of all obedience. The thought of obedience of necessity lies at the root of God's revealed

character. Obedience must be rendered if the creature is to enjoy fellowship with his Maker. Accordingly we find that after the exodus from Egypt when the Old Covenant was renewed with the people in their national capacity, the obedience which God had all along required in His people was clearly set forth. Thus it was that the Ten Commandments were given from Mount Sinai, the law proclaiming the necessity of obedience—a call "to walk in love." We must not, however, think that the law was intended to abrogate the Old Covenant as a Covenant of Grace—indeed, the introduction to the Ten Commandments should make this abundantly clear to our minds:

"God spake all these words, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage" (Ex. xx. 1, 2).

Thus the truth, "I am the Lord thy God," is the foundation on which all the Commandments stand; because of this they are not to have any other gods, etc. "Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God . . . that He may establish thee this day unto Himself for a people, and that He may be unto thee a God, as He spake unto thee, and as He sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob" (Deut. xxix. 10-13).

A SACRAMENT.

To every Covenant made with man, God has been pleased to attach an outward sign, in which all that is unfolded in the Word of the Covenant is implied and embodied.

For instance, of the first Covenant mentioned in Holy Scripture, the Noahic Covenant, God gave the bow as "the sign or Sacrament." The bow in the cloud is an object so familiar, and universal, that it may be little thought of by man, yet it always glorifies God, for it is an epitome of all that He graciously promised to Noah, and through him to all flesh, "The bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting Covenant" (Gen. ix. 8-16).

THE SACRAMENTS OF THE OLD COVENANT.

I.—Circumcision.

God was pleased to institute Circumcision as the sign or sacrament of the Abrahamic Covenant, "It shall be a token of the Covenant betwixt Me and thee" (Gen. xvii. 11). As the initial rite of the Old Covenant, Circumcision gathered up in itself all that was unfolded in the words of the Covenant, and was the divinely-appointed means of sealing its promises to each individual of the

seed of Abraham. In virtue of Circumcision (not as a mere external rite, but as the sign and seal of the Covenant) each Israelite could say, "The Lord is my God." In the case of an adult, however, the full enjoyment of this relationship was conditional, obedience of necessity being required.

When we say "conditional," it is important that we understand the term, and do not in any way associate it with the notion of a meritorious cause. A cause is that which originates an event or act; a condition is that without which the event or act so originated cannot actually take place. For instance, we may say that music is the cause of delightful sounds, but an ear for music is the indispensable condition of enjoying them. An ear for music is not, however, the cause, but the condition of enjoying music.

Now the cause of blessedness under the Old Covenant, was in the Covenant itself, viz., in the promises of God made to each individual in the sacrament of Circumcision; but the condition of a full enjoyment of the blessings, was trust in, and obedience to, Jehovah. This the people forgot; and thinking themselves secure in the possession of these blessings in virtue of their circumcision, they were content to have their minds occupied with earthly fancies rather than with the inquiry, "What is necessary on our part to the full attain-

ment of all these promises?" They completely ignored the fact that Circumcision was itself an engagement to holiness, and not in any sense a shelter from divine judgment in favour of disobedience and sin. It had become a common saying in the time of our Lord, "All the circumcised have part in the world to come" (Godet).

II.—The Passover.

Besides Circumcision, God ordained the Passover as a sacrament in connection with the Old Covenant. This sacrament was instituted before the giving of the Law from Mount Sinai, though not until the moment of Israel's departure from Egypt. Till then the Old Covenant rested on the great promise, "I will be their God." But when God so signally proved Himself to be their God by redeeming them out of the land of Egypt, divine Redemption was henceforth to be looked upon as the great central fact of the Covenant. From that time onward Israel was to behold in God, the Lord their Redeemer. And just as Circumcision embodied all the words of the Covenant, so the Passover was ever to be a proclamation of its foremost truth—redemption by blood.

The twelfth chapter of Exodus sets forth the Passover, how on that memorable night[1] the blood

[1] Compare St. Luke ix. 31, R.V. (marg.)

of a lamb, without blemish, was, by God's order, to be sprinkled over the door-posts and lintels of every Israelitish house. This sprinkling of the blood was to serve a threefold purpose:—

(1) To distinguish God's people from all others (vv. 22, 23).

(2) To inspire the Israelites with tranquility and confidence that they should not be hurt; "for the blood shall be *to you* for a token upon the houses where ye are" (v. 13).

(3) Above all, as the appointed means of deliverance from destruction (v. 23).

While, however, they were saved through the blood of the lamb, the lamb itself which was killed by every householder, was eaten in common by the family; not in order that they might be saved through its flesh (salvation was wrought by the blood thereof alone, sprinkled over the doorway), but as a token that, in virtue of its death they were alive unto God. The lamb was to be eaten roast, "its head with its legs and with the purtenance thereof," "with bitter herbs," "no bone of it was to be broken," and "nothing of it left until the morning," or, if left, it was to be "consumed with fire."

Moreover, those who ate on that night, fleeing as they were for life itself, had to eat it in haste,

with their feet shod, their loins girt, and their staves in their hands (see vv. 8-12, 46-48). But since the salvation, the rescue and flight could only be accomplished on that one occasion, and as the same circumstances would never again take place, so also the special ceremonies connected with that one night were never again repeated: as, for instance, the sprinkling of blood, the hurried manner in which the lamb was eaten, etc.

It is said the Jewish Rabbis reckoned nine particulars as distinguishing the Passover of Egypt from the Passover of the following generations. There was in reality but one Passover, the blood of a slain lamb fully accomplishing its divinely-appointed work on the night of the Exodus. Every succeeding Passover was a Paschal Feast, the eating of a slain lamb in joyful commemoration of that event once for all accomplished (v. 14), a proclamation of redemption (vv. 26, 27), a declaration that they were a redeemed nation, a people in fellowship with God (vv. 43-48).

Section III.

GOD'S DEALINGS WITH MAN UNDER THE NEW COVENANT.

The Old Covenant, which was but a shadow, an elementary school of grace, in the fulness of

time gave place to the New Covenant, its true substance, the perfect revelation of grace and truth.

This Covenant, consecrated and confirmed in the death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, gives its name to the second great division of the Bible—called the Book of the New Testament or Covenant.

In anticipation of it, Christ said at the Last Supper, "This cup is the New Covenant in My blood, even that which is poured out for you" (St. Luke xxii. 20). While the writer of the Hebrews says in memorable words, taken from Jeremiah the Prophet :—

8. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord,
That I will accomplish a New Covenant with the House of Israel, and with the House of Judah;
9. Not according to the Covenant that I made with their fathers,
In the day when I took them by the hand to lead them forth out of the land of Egypt;
For they continued not in My Covenant,
And I regarded them not, saith the Lord.
10. For this is the Covenant that I will make with the House of Israel
After those days, saith the Lord;
I will put My laws into their mind,
And on their heart also will I write them;
And I will be to them a God,
And they shall be to Me a people:

11. And they shall not teach every man his fellow-citizen,
And every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord;
For all shall know Me,
From the least to the greatest of them.
12. For I will be merciful to their iniquities,
And their sins will I remember no more."
(Heb. viii.)

Observe the great promise of the Old Covenant, "I will be their God," is here combined with the promise of forgiveness of sins, of perfect knowledge as to the Divine Will, and of ample means for the securing of obedience. In this we see the essential glory of the New Covenant, God not only provides a guarantee for His own faithfulness, but for the faithfulness of man as well.

Let us consider briefly each of the promises peculiar to the New Covenant:

1. *Willing obedience.*—"I will put My laws . . ." v. 10. We are soon brought to feel that there is an awful chasm between perception and inclination, that it is one thing to know our duty, and quite another to wish to do it. This was the one thing that Israel needed, "they remembered that God was their Rock, and the Most High God their Redeemer. But they flattered Him with their mouths, and lied unto Him with their tongues. For their heart was not right with Him. Neither were they faithful in His Covenant" (Psalm lxxviii. 35-37). But here is a promise that man's in-

clinations and desires shall coincide with the Divine Will, and that God Himself will produce this wonderful change. A life of obedience and true holiness of heart, the New Covenant is ever proclaiming as possible.[1]

2. *Perfect knowledge.*—"And they shall not teach every man . . ." v. 11. Under the Old Covenant there was what might be called a spiritual aristocracy, consisting of those who received divine communications, which they then imparted to their fellows. All who desired to know "what saith the Lord" had to receive it from their lips. But under the New Covenant there is no distinction; each one, the feeblest and the least, may know the Lord. It is true that Christian men and women vary in the extent to which they possess and utilise this gift of knowledge, and some are in advance of others, but the promise of the Spirit is to all alike: "He shall teach you all things"; "He will guide you into all truth"[2];

[1] "Under the Mosaic system the law was fixed and external: the new laws enter into the understanding as active principles to be realised and embodied by progressive thought. The old law was written on tables of stone: the new laws are written on the heart, and become, so to speak, part of the personality of the believer" (see Bishop Westcott on the "Hebrews," page 223. 1889).

[2] "A second characteristic of the New Covenant follows directly from the first. The people are brought into true fellow-

"The anointing which ye received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any one teach you: but as His anointing teacheth you concerning all things," etc. (1 St. John ii. 27). To know the Lord in the depths of the heart[1] is man's privilege under the New Covenant.

(3) *Free and full forgiveness.*—"For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness . . ." v. 12.[2] This blessing, although the last in order of enumeration, is the first in order of fulfilment; the intro-

ship with God, and this involves an immediate knowledge of Him. No privileged class is interposed between the mass of men and God. All are true scribes (St. John vi. 45) . . . All have immediate access to the Divine Presence. The description marks the absolute relation, but does not define how the universal privilege will be in fact realised" (Westcott on the "Hebrews.")

[1] "It is not a revelation to a man enabling him to solve an intellectual difficulty, such as an obscure passage of Scripture, or a disputed point of Church usage or history; it is the living sympathy and apprehension with which the heart answers to, and takes hold of, any announcement of the love or righteousness of God, and any claim which God makes on man to be conformed to His likeness, wherever these are found" ("Rule of Faith, Present Day Papers," page 82).

[2] "The third characteristic of the New Covenant is that which contains the pledge of its efficacy. It rests upon forgiveness on the part of God, not on performance on the part of man. Its foundation is grace, and not works (St. John i. 17). In this lies the assurance against such failure as the Old Covenant brought to light" (compare Isaiah lix. 2). (Westcott on the "Hebrews.")

ductory "for" shows that the other blessings rest on the fulfilment of this one. Forgiveness comes through the finished sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ, and means the flood of divine love forthgiven from God's own heart pouring itself across the black dam built up by human sin.

Forgiveness does not abrogate the law that "whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap," for it does not take away the memory of transgressions, nor their effects out of the character, yet it may so modify them that, instead of past sin being a means of torment or a tyrant which compels to future similar transgressions, pardoned sin may become a source of lowly self-distrust, and a means of casting a soul wholly upon the mercy and grace of God.

THE SACRAMENTS OF THE NEW COVENANT.

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ under the New Covenant—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. And as the Old Covenant shadowed forth the New, we cannot fail to observe a complete analogy between the Sacraments of both.

Thus Baptism under the New Covenant corresponds to Circumcision under the Old, and the Passover to the Lord's Supper.

And just as Circumcision was a visible declaration of Covenant-relationship to God and a conveyance of the promises of the Old Covenant; so, in like manner, Baptism is a visible declaration of Covenant-relationship to God in Christ, and a means of conveying the blessings of the New Covenant. St. Paul declares that the spiritual condition, formerly signified and sealed in Circumcision, is now signified and sealed by Baptism (see Col. ii. 11, 12, ". . . the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with Him in baptism").

Moreover, as the Supper of the Lord in the Old Testament, otherwise called the Passover, was a proclamation of the great fact of redemption by blood; so the Holy Communion, or Supper of the Lord in the New Testament, is a showing forth of our Redemption through the Blood of Christ (1 Cor. v. 7, 8).

Section IV.

THE PRIVILEGES AND RESPONSIBILITY OF LIVING UNDER THE NEW COVENANT (Hebrews xii. 18-29[1]).

The truth which lies on the surface of these verses is threefold:—

[1] The reference to Esau in the two previous verses (16, 17) should be noticed. In the House of Isaac was the expectation of a Messiah, and the knowledge and worship of the true God.

(1) The privilege of the New Covenant—"Ye are come."[1]

(2) The great responsibility which flows from the possession of privilege—"see that ye refuse not."

(3) The neglect of privilege and responsibility brings irreparable consequences—"shall not escape."

The privileges of the New Covenant as contrasted with the Old (typified by Sinai and Zion).

Sinai (vv. 18-21).

Your New Covenant standing does not consist in the recalling of the splendours and portents of Sinai, which made the people feel in what mysteri-

Esau must have known of the birthright and the blessing, for he could not have been ignorant of that which it was essential that he should know. But while neither infidel nor grossly immoral, Esau was a "profane person"—that is, he lived only for the present, and parted with that which he should have deemed of more worth than life itself. In consequence, he was rejected (though not in respect of his spiritual relation to God, if his repentance were sincere), and forfeited beyond recall the privileges of the first-born. In the unavailing sorrow of Esau, we may see foreshadowed our own miserable doom if the Christian birthright (the New Covenant standing) be despised.

[1] Although, in virtue of our New Covenant standing in Christ, we are admitted to a present participation in these glories, nevertheless in their fulness they await us when "the Lord shall be King over all the earth"! "The times of restoration of all things"—"Thy Kingdom come"!

ous and fearful proximity they stood to the invisible presence of God, and which, even in Moses, who was permitted to speak to God face to face, excited terror. He trembled as he thought of the all-searching holiness, the sublime and awful majesty of that Being, to whom, in virtue of the Covenant, they were as a nation continually nigh, abiding ever under His protection and discipline (Amos iii. 2).

Zion (vv. 22-24).

But this, through grace, is your true calling; a never failing to remember that your citizenship is in heaven (Phil. iii. 20), in that New Jerusalem one day to be manifested on the earth (Gal. iv. 26; Rev. xxi. 2-4); that you are verily a part of the household of God (Eph. ii. 19); that you are always in God's presence, under His all-watchful eye[1]; that you are in fellowship with that blessed company for whom His work has been fulfilled in righteousness, and in whom he now lives and reigns—"just men," spirits "made perfect," wait-

[1] See 1 Peter i. 17, 18 (R.V.) We are under the unceasing judgment of the Heavenly Father, who has redeemed us from all such modes of living as are merely handed down from earthly parents. In other words, the true Father is not merely the gracious Protector, Succourer, Provider; but also the constant, persistent, earnest, unsparing Educator, whose love deals closely and inexorably with each child of the family, in desire for its due training and its best development.

ing "the redemption of the body." Above all, you are in communion with Jesus, the Mediator, and under the influence of the blood "precious and incorruptible" (1 Peter i. 18, 19), which is ever present to the Divine Mind, determining the Divine action.

Obligations of the New Covenant (v. 25).

If Israel did not escape the result of neglecting and despising of the Old Covenant—much more shall not ye escape, who turn aside from all the grace uttered in word and work by the Lord from heaven. To neglect so great salvation is the deepest sin which man can commit. All other sin may be pardoned through the redemption which Love has made perfect, but this makes grace itself in vain. "The proportion of guilt measures the proportion of punishment." If the New Covenant be slighted, how can ye escape? (Heb. ii. 3).

The inauguration of the New Covenant (vv. 26, 27).

When the Old Covenant was given, Sinai trembled, for the Divine voice spoke. And that Voice was a shaking of earthly things, for nations were dispossessed, and their lands given to Israel, and thenceforth the homes of Israel, the duties of rulers, the obligations of citizens, were bent, swayed and governed, by the Old Covenant.

But in the New Covenant in Christ's Blood, an earthquake shook the ground, the graves were

opened, and right up to the very throne of God the voice of the Divine Victim passed. And lo, every barrier was broken down, the veil was rent, the aspect of the heavens was changed. Man was brought nigh. Mercy and grace and love were henceforth to rule and reign supreme. Truly the whole significance of life under the New Covenant is gathered up in that one great cry of the Victor —"It is finished."

And what abides? (v. 28, first part).

The Kingdom of our God. That Kingdom which Christ came to establish. It abides for ever; no human sin can sap its strength, no malice of hell can annihilate it. Satan may assault and hurt it, but Christ "shall gather out of His Kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity . . . then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the Kingdom of their Father" (St. Matt. xiii. 41, 43).

The closing exhortation (vv. 28, last part, and 29).

Let us have thankfulness, whereby we may serve. Covenant relationship to God in Christ, demands service. The call is the same as ever, a call to serve, "redeemed for service," a service, springing out of an ever-increasing sense of gratitude, and expressing itself more and more fully in a life of reverent submission and godly fear. For God, fully manifested in Christ, is essentially the

same as was manifested to Israel, all-holy and hating iniquity (Exodus xx. 5); "our God is a consuming fire."

Section V.

COVENANT STANDING THE BASIS OF ALL TRUE EDUCATION.

The education of all children in Israel rested on the fact of Covenant-relationship to God.

The all-essential truths which, according to the law of Moses, every Israelitish child had to learn, were—its redemption by God out of Egypt, and its Covenant standing towards God. The teaching of these truths was the only family education expressly provided for by the national lawgiver :—

Deut. iv. 9, 10—"Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes saw, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life; but make them known unto thy children, and thy children's children; the day that thou stoodest before the Lord thy God in Horeb, when the Lord said unto me, Assemble Me the people, and I will make them hear My words, that they may learn to fear Me all the days that they live upon the earth, and that they may teach their children."

Exodus xii. 26, 27—"And it shall come to pass when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? That ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, Who passed over the houses of the Children of Israel in Egypt, when He smote the Egyptians, and delivered our houses."

Every Israelitish child had to be taught that all that was expressed at Sinai was an abiding reality, that he was as much in the presence of God as when that Presence was then manifested, that all generations shared in the blessings as if they personally had been redeemed out of Egypt, that they must know that they were continually nigh unto God, that it was in His Heart to bless and preserve them, and that their happiness consisted in acknowledging and keeping the Covenant of their God, for they were a people of inheritance unto the Lord.

One of the first lessons given by every faithful father in Israel must have been to this effect:—My child, you are in covenant with God. God has redeemed you, you are His child, therefore seek to love and serve Him with all your heart. All the blessings that God promised our father Abraham He desires that you should possess; do not then despise them or let them go, they are yours, your blessings and your responsibilities.

And has not God entered into covenant with us? Were we not redeemed through the Blood of the New Covenant, the precious Blood of Christ shed for us? Do we not claim for our children, in their baptism, the blessings of the New Covenant? And shall we not make it the very basis of all education to teach them that they are members of Christ, the children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven? that it is their bounden duty to consider themselves as such; that they sin against God when they despise or forget these blessings; that their real danger consists not in making too much, but too little, of their privileges—of limiting the Holy One of Israel?

Christian parent, have you taught your child to say:—"I heartily thank our Heavenly Father, that He hath called me to this state of salvation, through Jesus Christ our Saviour. And I pray unto God to give me His grace, that I may continue in the same unto my life's end"? (see the Church Catechism).

And are you continually setting before your child, in word and example, how to live suitably to this high and heavenly calling? Are you instructing him that as "a member of Christ," he is bound to renounce all membership with evil and the evil one, ". . . for what fellowship hath righteousness and iniquity? or what communion hath

light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial?" (2 Cor. vi. 14, 15). That as "the child of God" he must learn to trust in our Heavenly Father, and especially in the revelation which He has given of Himself in our Lord Jesus Christ, and which is summed up for us in "the Articles of our Belief"—"for ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii. 26). And that as an inheritor of God's everlasting Kingdom, he is bound to keep God's holy will and commandments always, for concerning that kingdom it is said, "there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean" (Rev. xxi. 27). Oh, strive earnestly that your child may learn that all the promises of God in Christ are his[1]—his rightful inheritance, and that the faith and obedience which God requires are guaranteed to him in the New Covenant—that an all-sufficient grace will be his, if only he seek it by diligent prayer, and that therefore he must fight under Christ's banner, as a good soldier, "continually mortifying all his evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living."

[1] "O take up your lodgings in the attributes and promises of God, before the night overtake you: view them often by faith, and clear up your interest in them, that you may be able to go to them in the dark, when the Ministers and Ordinances of Christ have taken their leave of you, and bid you good-night" (John Flavell).

CHAPTER III.

The Sacrament of Baptism.

Section I.

THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM.

WE have already spoken of the Sacrament of Baptism, in Section 3 of the previous Chapter, as the initial rite of the New Covenant, gathering up into itself all the New Covenant promises, viz., Relationship to God in Christ, the Forgiveness of sins, the Knowledge of God's will, and the Walking worthy unto all pleasing. Let us begin this Chapter by observing how all this is fully reflected in the teaching of Scripture respecting Baptism.

Notice, first of all, how the very form[1] of

[1] One must, I suppose, of necessity use technical terms. Now, concerning the Sacraments, we speak of "matter" and "form" as the two essentials to their right administration. Matter is the thing used in a Sacrament, and form denotes the sacramental words. The matter in Baptism is water. The form in Baptism

Baptism sets forth the Relationship to God—the Tri-Une God—"baptizing them *into* the Name[1] of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" (St. Matt. xxviii. 19).

Baptism also proclaims "the Forgiveness of sins"—"And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ[2] unto the remission of your sins . . ."

consists of the words, "In the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," together with the mention of Baptism. In the Order of Private Baptism we read: "Because some things essential to this Sacrament may happen to be omitted . . . therefore I demand further of you with what matter was this child baptized? With what words was this child baptized?"

[1] See 1 Cor. i. 12-14, especially 13. "The Cross has made Christ the Head of the body. By Baptism every believer becomes a member of that body. . . . To be baptized 'in the name of' signifies: to be plunged in water while engaging henceforth to belong to Him, in whose name the external rite is performed. 'In the name,' there is summed up all that is revealed regarding him who bears it, consequently all the titles of his legitimate authority. Baptism is, therefore, a taking possession of the baptized on the part of the person whose name is invoked over him. Never did St. Paul dream for an instant of arrogating to himself such a position, yet this would be implied by such a saying as 'I am of Paul'" (Godet).

[2] "When anyone is baptized into Christ, it is in virtue of Christ's death that the bond thus formed is contracted. For by His Blood we have been bought with a price, and Baptism gives us, in fact, what belongs to us in right, by this act of purchase. Baptism supposes the death of Christ and our death in Him, as

(Acts ii. 38). "... arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on His Name" (Acts xxii. 16).

Baptism, moreover, declares the possibility of Knowing God's will, and of Walking worthy unto all pleasing. "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you ... and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts ii. 38). "... are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into His death? We were buried therefore with Him through baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life" (Rom. vi. 3, 4). "And ye have an anointing from the Holy

we have it set forth in 2 Cor. v. 14, 15 ('... one died for all. therefore all died,' R.V.) In consequence of this death to sin undergone in Christ Jesus, we are buried with Him through Baptism in relation to death (His death and ours). The act of Baptism is not the death, it is rather the burial, the proof of our death in Christ—just as burial is the external proof of decease. And this burial with Christ in baptism is, moreover, for the express purpose of our rising with Christ. It is not intended that we should remain in the tomb, as it were, inactive and lifeless, or issue from it to return to the old life of sin. For just as Christ by His burial broke the last tie with His earthly life and entered on a higher life, so the believer by his baptism finds himself placed between a life which has taken end, and a wholly different one which opens before him" (see Godet on Romans vi.).

One, and ye know all things" (1 St. John ii. 20; compare also v. 27[1]).

But what of little children who are unconscious, and who cannot therefore fulfil the conditions which God has attached to this Sacrament? We reply that Holy Scripture nowhere denies to them Christian discipleship, or the blessings of the New Covenant (see Section 5).

Accordingly, when babes and little ones are brought to baptism, the Church rightly prays that God would "mercifully look upon them and sanctify them with the Holy Ghost." And after Baptism, says: "We yield Thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased Thee to regenerate these Infants with Thy Holy Spirit,

[1] "The very term 'anointing' would lead one to think of an act in part outward, and since it was employed under the Jewish law to consecrate things or persons to the service of God, it might the more obviously be used for the consecration of 'lay-priesthood,' as Baptism is called by St. Jerome; and that the more since our Blessed Saviour was actually consecrated and anointed (compare St. Luke iii. 21, 22; iv. 1, 14, 16) by the descent and abiding of the Holy Ghost at His Baptism, and then became the Christ: since, moreover, the same seven-fold gifts of the Holy Spirit, which were bestowed upon the Christ at His Baptism (Isaiah xi. 1; lxi. 1; St. Luke iv. 18), are here spoken of by St. John as having been in their measure imparted to Christians; and 'anointing' is by St. Paul (2 Cor. i.) united with the 'sealing' of Baptism. To this may be added the very use of the name, 'the anointing' in Christian antiquity to designate Baptism" (Pusey on "Baptism," page 42. 1836).

to receive them for Thine own children by adoption, and to incorporate them into Thy Holy Church."

Can little children put a bar to the right reception of Holy Baptism? True they are born in sin, but the New Covenant of God in Christ expressly provides for the cleansing from all sin, both original and actual, and it cannot but be that little children who receive the sign and seal of this Covenant, receive through Baptism its fundamental blessing.

The Sacrament of Baptism being the sign and seal of the New Covenant, which is world-embracing, is a proclamation of the good-will of our heavenly Father towards each and every child—that while in Adam all alike have sinned, and are by nature the children of wrath, yet in Christ Jesus, and on the ground of all that He is and has done on our behalf, the flood of divine love is more than willing to pour itself into every life; it is therefore our bounden duty to claim for our children this new condition, and to sign and seal them in Baptism, "the children of grace": the very font should ever be a witness to us, that God is infinitely ready to embrace every infant with the arms of His mercy.

Since God, of His own wondrous grace, has bound Himself in the New Covenant to be a God unto us and to our children, to forgive us our sins, and to enable us to live to His glory, and these

blessings stored up in the Covenant are visibly conveyed in Holy Baptism—this Sacrament, therefore, is to all alike, infants as well as adult believers, "the laver of regeneration"[1]; "the beginning of the Christian life."

But this Sacrament not only proclaims the beginning, it sets forth also the consummation of the life.

God will fulfil all His promises, and the great promise of the Covenant, "I will be their God," essentially involves a condition when spirit, soul and body shall be alike perfected in holiness—when the Redeemer of the soul "shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be

[1] See Titus iii. 5.—"God hath saved us by His mercy, the symbol and pledge of which He gave in baptism, by admitting us into His Church, and engrafting us into the Body of His Son. Baptism is fitly and truly said to be 'the laver of regeneration' (Calvin).

"St. Peter also declares (1 Peter iii. 20, 21) that what the water of the flood was to the rescued family of Noah, such is Baptism to the Christian Church . . . 'eight souls were saved by water' (were rescued on the bosom of the flood from the ruin of the old world into the blessing of the new). '. . . The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us' (by baptism our transition is now effected from the world on which the curse of God rests, into the family of His delivered ones, who have the promise and hope of the eternal inheritance)."

With these two pages compare 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. "The crossing of the Red Sea was to the Israelites as baptism is to the believer, the threshold of salvation" (Godet).

conformed to the body of His glory" (Phil. iii. 21). "We know that, if He shall be manifested, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him even as He is" (1 St. John iii. 2).

In the closing Exhortation of our Baptismal Service it is said:—". . . baptism doth represent unto us our profession . . . to be made like unto Him."

Moreover, this Sacrament not only gathers up in itself the beginning and the ending of the Christian life, it is also the golden thread running through it, for it ever reminds us that the whole treasury of divine grace, stored up in the New Covenant, is laid open in Baptism to be enjoyed throughout the whole life.

"There is not," it has been well said, "a promise, blessing, or privilege, which is not constantly in our power, and continually offered to us as baptized members of Christ's flock." There are no offices of the Father to lead us unto Christ, no offices of the Son to redeem us from all unrighteousness, no offices of the Holy Ghost to restore us to the image of God, no revelation of Their love, no assurance of Their help, which were not made patent and free to us on the day on which we were baptized into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And however unworthy and wandering our lives may

be, words cannot tell the love and longing with which our Heavenly Father yearns over us, nor the welcome with which He receives us to the House of which we are the children. Oh! if our course of unnatural disobedience has been like the prodigal's, when we return in the spirit of the prodigal we receive from Him the prodigal's welcome—the fond, exuberant, unbounded welcome of our Heavenly Father. "Baptism," says Martin Luther, "is the sacrament of repentance, for truly to repent leads a man back to his baptism, from which he has fallen." We may be unfaithful, but God nevertheless remains ever true; "He, for His part, will most surely keep and perform."

Whenever a soul feels the weight of sin, and is conscious that his transgressions are many and great, sufficient to plunge him to the very depths of hell itself, let that soul remember that all his demerits are as nothing in comparison with the merits of Christ, that sin in all its awful depths is but a shallow when compared with that redeeming love that goes down beneath all sin. Jesus is "able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through Him" (Heb. vii. 25), and can anyone be beyond the reach of His uttermost? can anything exhaust His power to save? The one hope and refuge of a sin-stricken soul is firm, penitential reliance upon the faithfulness of

Him, Who hath said, "their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more."

The Prayer Book everywhere teaches that when the wicked man, repenting truly of his former sins, and steadfastly purposing to lead a new life, shall humble himself before God, in firm reliance on God's promises in Christ Jesus, his repentance shall, through the mediation of his Saviour, be available to his salvation. The English Church believes no other act, no other feeling requisite to restore the sinner to the favour of God. But the Romish Church thinks differently; admitting equally with the Church of England the necessity of repentance, she does not admit equally, or at least not in the same sense, the sufficiency of repentance, though conjoined with faith, for the restoration of the sinner who has fallen after Baptism. She asserts that God in His mercy has ordained another Sacrament, viz., Penance, as the instrument of grace, and the seal of pardon and peace to the contrite soul. Now, there is nothing in this, at first sight, either contrary to the principles of reason or to the analogy of faith; and if it had pleased the Almighty to institute this Sacrament, the English Church would unquestioningly have received it. But as she does not conceive it to be so ordained, she rejects it as unwarranted in principle, and as (from experience of its workings)

very dangerous in effect. It is worthy of special notice that, until about the year 1833, there was scarcely to be found any rightly-instructed English Churchman but could quiet his own conscience, feeling assured, from the obvious teaching of his Bible and Book of Common Prayer, that God will not despise the broken and contrite spirit. But, through the rise of the Oxford Movement and the doubts cast upon the forgiveness of sins committed after Baptism (for instance, see Pusey on "Baptism," pages 60-63), and the natural aiming after a full-orbed system of belief in harmony with such doubts, many devout English Churchmen have been led in the present day to resort habitually to a priest in the hope of obtaining reconciliation through ministerial absolution, to the favour of God.

While the Church of England does not conceive ministerial absolution as necessary to the reconciling of the penitent to the favour of God, she does, however, recognize that her absolution may in some cases give quiet and consolation to the troubled conscience; but when the penitent is calm and free from trouble, she thinks it needless (see the closing words of the first Exhortation in the Communion Office; also the Rubric before the Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick), her doctrine being in common with the rest of the Reformed Churches,

'Crede te absolutum et absolutus es' (See "The British Critic," page 140. 1826).

"O merciful Father, look upon the Covenant, for in me Thou wilt find nothing but what well deserves Thy wrath, or is worthy of eternal death. Thy mercy can deliver me. Thy unutterable and unchangeable mercy which I have despised and rebelled against, can deliver me from Thy all-just anger. Deign therefore to receive me, O Lord, now that I return to Thee, and so fill me with Thy grace, the Holy Spirit Himself, that He may teach me to do Thy will, that my soul, with all its powers, may henceforth yearn after Thy glory, and desire to fulfil all Thy good pleasure, that in the end I may be redeemed and brought safely out of my self-willed wanderings to Thy feet for ever."

Oh, it is no vain dream to ask what God has bound Himself to impart. No one can expect too confidently, or know the answer too assuredly, when the petitions are within the broad boundaries that eternal love staked out. In the midst of all life's storms and dangers, remember then this Covenant, steadfast as God Himself, and look upon thy Baptism as an anchor of hope, proclaiming ever—"And behold I am with thee, and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest . . . for I will not leave thee, until I have done that

which I have spoken to thee of" (Gen. xxviii. 15).

While, however, Baptism spreads the hope of God's grace over the whole life, it at the same time spreads also the all-embracing obligation connected therewith, to keep the Covenant which is in Christ, and to abide in the fellowship of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost.

Baptism rests these obligations, as we have seen, on the promises of God made to us in that Sacrament. For it is entirely opposed to the Gospel to speak of Christian duty as if separated from divine grace (grace ever precedes duty, and prepares and strengthens the soul for the due fulfilment of it), and Baptism, as a Sacrament of the Gospel, could not impose any duties on man without first of all promising an all-sufficient grace for the performance of the same. Under the New Covenant obedience is possible—the promises of grace, and power to will and to do as God willeth, are its essential glory. This obedience is of faith; all things, even in the way of obedience, are possible to him that believeth. Act on that faith, believe that the Holy Ghost is within you, and continually ask God to work in you through Him. Throw yourself upon the Covenant, and henceforth look upon your body as a temple of God, inhabited by the Spirit, and through His indwelling influence you will be enabled "to keep God's holy will and

commandments, and to walk in the same all the days of your life."

Section II.

THE MINISTRATION OF PUBLIC BAPTISM OF INFANTS.

The Prayer Book Service for the Public Baptism of Children may be divided into four parts :—

(1) The blessings of the Covenant.
(2) The acceptance of the Covenant.
(3) The Covenant sealed.
(4) Covenant privileges and obligations.

Part I.

The Blessings of the Covenant.

1. *The Exhortation.*—After enquiring if the child has been baptized or no, there is an exhortation showing the necessity of regeneration or new birth. This necessity is clearly set forth in our Saviour's words to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the Kingdom of God" (St. John iii. 3)—"not," you observe, "he shall not," but "he cannot," in the very nature of things it is impossible. How terrible is the contrast between God's character and the native character of man! how necessary that man should be conformed to God's image in order to enjoy God's presence!

Accordingly, the Church exhorts all present to pray that the child may share in this blessing, and become a living member of Christ's Church.

2. *First Collect.*—The prayer begins by reminding us that the very nature of Christian Baptism should lead us to pray for these blessings. It opens with a commemoration of two Old Testament facts, "the Flood" and "the Crossing of the Red Sea." Now to Noah and his family, the Flood renewed the face of the earth, for it lifted them out of the condemned world and brought them into a new world (2 Peter ii. 5). And the Crossing of the Red Sea cut the Children of Israel off from their Egyptian bondage and brought them into a new condition, in which, under the leadership of Moses, the typical redeemer ("baptized into Moses" 1 Cor. x. 2), they advanced towards the Land of Promise. And these Old Testament facts are set forth by the Holy Ghost as figures of spiritual realities, types of New Testament Baptism, foreshadowing how Baptism would declare man's redemption by Christ, his Covenant standing in Christ, and the promise of an eternal inheritance through Christ. But of those redeemed out of Egypt, many were overthrown in the wilderness (1 Cor. x. 1-12), and of those "eight souls saved by water" (1 Peter iii. 20), one was Ham, "the accursed." We are therefore

bidden to pray that no such catastrophe may happen in the case of the child about to be baptized, but that instead a personal realisation of his new condition may, in due time, manifest itself in a new disposition toward God—the disposition of faith in His Word, joy and hope in His promise, and love of His Name—that so at length he may reach "the Land of everlasting life."[1]

3. *Second Collect.*—This prayer, after setting forth how the blessings which God bestows, meet every need in all the separate stages of a soul's life; goes on to quote that solemn declaration by Christ as to the condition of our receiving blessings at the hand of God. "Ask . . . Seek . . . Knock. . . ." The Father ever giving and the child ever in the attitude of receiving, express indispensable elements in the life of grace. To all the baptized our Church says:—"Know this,

[1] Reference is also made in this prayer to our Lord's Baptism in the Jordan. Christ's Baptism is a pattern of ours, for when He was baptized the Three Persons in the Blessed Trinity revealed Themselves: the Father by a voice from Heaven; the Son by water (St. John i. 31, 33; 1 St. John v. 6); and the Holy Ghost by the Dove. Our Lord, moreover, declared that His Baptism was essentially united to His work of fulfilling all righteousness (St. Matt. iii. 15), and that, too, for our sakes, that in due time He might sanctify water, and set it apart to our mystical cleansing and our "living unto righteousness" (Rom. vi. 4; Eph. v. 25-27).

that thou art not able to do these things of thyself, nor to walk in the commandments of God, and to serve Him, without His special grace, which thou must learn at all times to call for by diligent prayer." The treasure-house of all riches which God wills to bestow and which He seals to the individual in Baptism (the appointed sign of "the everlasting benediction of His heavenly washing") opens always to the knock of prayer.

One of the most glorious of Old Testament promises closes thus: "I will yet for this be enquired of by the House of Israel to do it for them" (Ezek. xxxvi. 37).

4. *The Gospel with Exhortation.* — After the second Collect there follows a reading from St. Mark's Gospel, with a brief exhortation. While there is no actual allusion to the Sacrament of Baptism, no portion of Scripture could be more suitable, for it records the bringing of little children to Christ, and how, when others would have repelled them, not so the Lord Jesus; "He blamed those that would have kept them from Him," "He took them up in His arms" (then they must have been quite young, some of them little infants), "and blessed them" (then they are susceptible of a spiritual blessing), and declared "that of such is the Kingdom of God" (then He sees in them the children of His Father).

And when, in reading this narrative, we remember also that every word and action of our Lord's whole human life were an ever-living expression of the mind of our Heavenly Father, an unveiling of the heart of God, no doubt can remain as to the will of God to bless every little infant brought to Him.

5. *Thanksgiving and Prayer.*—The great mercy and condescension of God in making known His love, and admitting infants into a state of grace, to which we, in like manner, were once called, demands the utterance of our thankfulness, and the renewal of our acknowledgments, together with prayer that the child may be born again and be made an heir of glory.

Part II.

The Acceptance of the Covenant.

6. *Address to Sponsors.*—The Service hitherto has spoken of that which comes wholly from God—"God's part"—His overtures of mercy through Christ. The second part of the Service sets forth man's response—the faith and obedience required by God on the part of man.

God has laid a glorious foundation for His Covenant—a free offer of forgiveness through the Blood of His own Son—that precious and peace-speaking Blood, the full price of man's redemp-

tion, "the Blood of the eternal Covenant." And what He desires man to do is to place his confidence on this foundation,[1] to count Him faithful Who has promised, and to be persuaded that what He has promised He is both able and willing to perform.

But obedience, as well as faith, are required; that both these are indispensable articles of the Covenant is obvious from the whole tenor of Scripture. Be not deceived then; he who subscribes to the Covenant, subscribes it in all its articles, and to have its full benefits there must be an honest and habitual effort to fulfil all its conditions. But does this not place the sinner just where he was before? No, for as the Covenant begins with grace, so it ends with grace; it begins on the side of God, Who binds Himself "to release us of our sins," and it is completed on the side of

[1] "We do not enough contemplate the Christian salvation in the form of a Covenant. . . . It were well if Christians looked more at this, and dwelt more on this, as being the very condition and state of the matter between them and God—so that, instead of the vague and loose and general views that take no real or practical hold of a man, they were made precisely and distinctly to understand what the obligations are which lie upon each—what the things are, on the one hand, they owe to God; and what, on the other hand, the things are which the great God of heaven and earth has bound Himself to do for them . . ." (From the last Sermon written by Dr. Chalmers, "Posthumous Works," Vol. VI., page 473).

God, Who pledges Himself "to sanctify us with the Holy Ghost, to give us the Kingdom of Heaven, and everlasting life." It is our part of the Covenant that henceforth we should obey, but it is God's part that He should enable us to obey. With a soldier, a servant, a child, a subject, obedience is indispensable, the first token of integrity; and shall the living Lord find no obedience with us? Assuredly not. "Wherefore, after this promise made by Christ, this infant must also faithfully for *his* part promise . . ."

7. *The Interrogatories and Answers.*—In consequence, the first duty of every one baptized is:

(1) To renounce everything contrary to God—the devil, the great enemy of all goodness, and those delusions of the world and impulses of the flesh by which he allures us away from goodness.

(2) To embrace whatever God has revealed for the instruction and consolation of His children.

And as we are called upon to renounce what God hates, and to believe what He teaches, in order to attain His supreme purpose and the chief end of our being, therefore every one baptized is engaged also:

(3) "To keep God's holy will and commandments, and to walk in the same all the days of his life."

8. *Four Short Prayers.*—The child being thus pledged to live the New Covenant life, the Church prays that he may attain to the full and complete meaning of his Baptism:

(1) That rooted in Christ as the fruitful soil of his soul's life, he may grow up into Him—"the new man may be raised up in him."

(2) That this union may manifest itself in fruitfulness—"all things belonging to the Spirit may live and grow in him."

(3) And consequently in victory over sin and temptation—"triumph against the devil, the world, and the flesh."

(4) And lastly be consummated in glory—"everlastingly rewarded, through Thy mercy, O blessed Lord God."

But these blessings, be it remembered, are not bestowed upon the soul like natural endowments—they are ours only in unceasing dependence upon, and in close contact with, God. Only as we abide in Christ closely, fully, wholly, can we bring forth much fruit. Only as we trust and yield ourselves to the Spirit's influence does it possess us and enable us to be more than conquerors. The secret of the New Covenant life is faith in the all-sufficient faithfulness of God.

Part III.

The Covenant Sealed.

In this third part of the Service reference is made to the congregation as a whole, special stress having been laid in the opening rubric of the Service on Baptism being performed before the congregation. It commences with a prayer for—

9. *The Benediction of the Water.*—This prayer is introduced by a reference to an event in our Saviour's Passion of how "one of the soldiers with a spear pierced His side, and straightway there came out blood and water" (St. John xix. 34). Concerning "the first man Adam," "a figure of Him that was to come" (1 Cor. xv. 45; Rom. v. 14), we are told that as he was sleeping Eve, his wife, was formed, being made out of his side (Gen. ii. 21-23); so the second Adam fell on sleep, the sleep of death upon the Cross, that out of His side might be formed His spouse the Church, and in that sacred fountain of blood and water she is washed that she may "have part with Him" (St. John xiii. 8; Eph. v. 25-27). Our Lord did not, however, merely figure this Sacrament in a mystical manner, but after His resurrection gave an express commandment to His disciples to go and baptize all nations. Accordingly, the Church, as the Lord's remembrancer, spreads out before

the Eternal Father this commission of her Lord, and prays that to the water about to be used for Baptism His own word and promise may be annexed, and that the child baptized therein may receive each and every blessing signed and sealed in this Sacrament.

10. *The Baptism.*—The name of the Blessed Trinity is with water placed upon the child. This divinely-appointed introduction into the name of the Tri-Une God is set forth in our Catechism thus—"Wherein" (as in a Covenant of which Baptism is a sign and seal) "I was made a member of Christ" (the relation to the Son), "the child of God" (the relation to the Father), "and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven" (the relation to the Holy Ghost).

11. *Signing with the Cross.*—The Cross on which Christ submitted to the will of God, suffering death at the hands of sinful men, symbolizes that divine grace which bringeth salvation to man, and, at the same time, crosseth his will and giveth contradiction to his corrupt affections, and constantly opposeth itself to the inordinate and fleshly appetites of his mind, and so may be justly termed the very instrument of man's dying to the world, and being made comformable to the will of God. Thus, while "Baptism doth represent unto us our profession," the Cross on the brow proclaimeth its

true nature—viz., the denial and offering up of self, by the mercies of God, to do or suffer the will of God for His service and glory. The Cross is Christianity in symbol—he who cannot endure Christ's Cross can never hope to share in His crown.[1]

12. *The Address.*—The congregation are herein reminded that since this child is by Baptism taken[2] out of the dark state of hopeless condemnation inherited from Adam and placed into the new state of life and hope which he has in Christ (1 Peter i. 3; iii. 21), being numbered with the children of God's Covenant marching towards the Canaan of God's inheritance, they ought, therefore, to thank Him for these benefits, and pray that this child may in due time yield himself to the New Covenant life of service.

[1] The 30th Canon mentioned in the note at the end of the Baptismal Service says in reference to the use of the Cross in Baptism: "... the Church of England, since the abolishing of Popery, hath ever held and taught, and so doth hold still, that the Sign of the Cross used in Baptism is no part of the substance of that Sacrament ... so as the Sign of the Cross being afterwards used, doth neither add anything to the virtue and perfection of Baptism, nor being omitted doth detract anything from the effect and substance of it."

[2] It is worthy of notice that in the Service headed "Private Baptism of Children in Houses," this Address is worded thus:—"Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is by Baptism regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church."

Part IV.

Covenant Privileges and Obligations.

13. *The Lord's Prayer.*—This entire prayer, at once in its opening address "Our Father," and in every one of its petitions, is the breathing of the spirit of adoption, the recognition of Covenant mercy, and the utterance of confidence in God's relation to us.

The most advanced saint can say nothing more than "Our Father"; the soul that has been longest in the presence of God, and made the best use of its opportunities, can use no word which expresses so much as "Father," which claims such relationship, and involves such obedience.

14. *The Thanksgiving.*—First of all, our Heavenly Father is thanked for the new life of reconciliation and adoption into which this child, having been buried with Christ in Baptism, is now brought, and prayer is offered that all the rich blessings of the Covenant may become the child's practical possession by his life-appropriation of them. We pray that he

> ". . . may crucify the old man and utterly abolish the whole body of sin;
>
> ". . . may be partaker of Christ's resurrection;
>
> ". . . may be an inheritor of the Father's everlasting Kingdom."

"Set your mind," says St. Paul (Col. iii. 2-5), "on the things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth. For ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, Who is our life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also with Him be manifested in glory. Put to death therefore your members which are upon the earth."

15. *Two Exhortations to the Sponsors.*—In these the Sponsors are charged to take care that the child be taught as soon as possible the meaning of the vows made in his name, and in due time be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed.

That the child may rightly learn the meaning of his baptism emphasis is placed on—

(*a*) Instructing the child's mind.

> "Ye are to call upon this child to hear sermons, and chiefly ye shall provide that he may learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. . . ." [1]

[1] ". . . It is the fundamental doctrines of the Catechism, which I most highly value, and daily think of, and find most useful to myself and others. The Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, do find me now the most acceptable and plentiful matter for all my meditations. They are to me as my daily bread and drink. And, as I can speak and write of them over and over again, so I had rather read or hear of them, than any of the school-niceties, which once so much pleased me. And thus I observed it was with old Archbishop Usher, and with many other men." (Richard Baxter, written some few years before his death. See his "Practical Works," Vol. I., page 54).

(*b*) And disciplining his will.

> "And that this child may be virtuously brought up, to lead a godly and a Christian life."

It is not enough to teach children, and to pray for them and with them; there must be the exercise over them of that authority, which God has given for their good. Children need to be disciplined, to be restrained with the cords of love (Prov. xxii. 6, 15).

It was, you remember, the righteous charge that Abraham took of his own house, that exalted him to become the depositary of "the secret of the Lord" (Gen. xviii. 17-19); and from being an ordinary father, to be honoured and reverenced throughout all generations, as "the Father of the Faithful," and "the Friend of God."

With Abraham contrast Eli. What a fearful stigma God placed on his memory, and all because, while good in himself, he did not instil his spirit into his children, did not command them as Abraham did—"I have told him that I will judge his house for ever, because his sons did bring a curse upon themselves, and he restrained them not" (1 Sam. iii. 13).

Christian parents should never for one moment lose sight of the fact that Baptism is the starting-point for all instruction and discipline. A child

should continually be reminded that his baptism signs and seals to him God's Covenant mercy and and his own duty towards God; that it is his salvation in figure, he was made one plant with Christ in the likeness of His death, that henceforth he should live in the full power and fellowship of the death and resurrection of Jesus.[1]

"When children shall thus be brought up, not with occasional reference to religion (as it is called), or with occasional religious instruction, but 'setting God always before them'; judging of all their actions with reference to God's law; looking at them as little ones, indeed, but still as members of Christ, and so imparting to them the privileges of His members; disciplining their wills in the same way, according to their proportion, as we should discipline our own; placing before them no motives but those which, as Christians, we would act ourselves; taking no standard of little or great, right or wrong—(not custom, nor nature, nor affection, nor ease)—but only God's

[1] Was not this aspect of Baptism shadowed forth in the action of the Patriarchs claiming by burial the promises of the Old Covenant? Abraham was given the land of Canaan for a possession, yet he owned no portion of it save a purchased burying-place. In full trust in God's promise, he and the rest of the Patriarchs buried their dead in that land; thus it is mentioned as a special act of Joseph's faith that "he gave commandment concerning his bones" (Heb. xi. 22; Gen. l. 24, 25).

law; regarding them, in fact, as miniatures, or rather as the first outline of the full-grown Christian, which, by God's blessing, shall acquire, day by day, fresh depth and breadth and consistency: then may we, indeed, hope that 'our sons may be as plants, grown up in their youth; our daughters as corner-stones, polished like a temple'; then may our country be once more 'the glory of lands,' a chosen instrument of extending our Redeemer's kingdom in others, because it will have come 'with power' in our own: then may we take the blessing of the Psalmist, 'Happy is that people that is in such a case, yea, blessed is the people that hath the Lord for their God.' Such also, we may see, has been the method of God, for the most part, in extending His Church hitherto, since its first planting. He has used, namely, the instrumentality of Christian nations, even more than that of individual Christians, however eminent. It is by nourishing up and multiplying sons and daughters of our common mother, far more than by the adoption of children not her own into the family of Christ, that His kingdom has been enlarged; and secondarily, by the contact of Christian nations, the leaven working in them has spread beyond their bounds. The means are evidently prepared for rendering colonization a far more effective means than ever before

of extending in either way Christ's kingdom; but before we think of so extending it, the leaven must have worked thoroughly through our own mass; and for this, and that we may not rather be the source of a moral infection, we must train up our children in their baptismal privileges, in the full confidence that the 'promise, which God has made, He for His part will most surely keep and perform'" (Pusey's "Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism," pages 205-206. 1836).

Section III.

THE DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION IN BAPTISM AS TAUGHT BY THE EARLIER DIVINES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Concerning the Sacrament of Baptism, few things strike an impartial student more than the contrast in teaching between the older and the more recent Divines of the Reformed Church of England. For instance, the constant use of the term "Covenant," and the speaking of Baptism as a "sign and seal" of it, so marked a feature in the older, has scarcely any place in modern Anglican teaching. How strange would sound to modern ears a common practice of typical and devout Churchmen of the older school such as

Robert Nelson, who prayed constantly for their own Regeneration, and taught others to do the same. The following may be said to express the grounds on which the older doctrine rested:

(*a*) The inward part or thing signified in Baptism is Regeneration or "new birth." And as in the Lord's Supper the inward part or thing signified includes all the blessings linked to that Sacrament, so Regeneration comprises the benefits to which the baptized are entitled.

(*b*) Holy Scripture describes this Regeneration or new birth as a real transformation, a being "perfect" in the absolute sense of the term. Thus St. John says, "He that is born of God" "doeth righteousness," "cannot sin," which statements are not metaphorical but simple, plain, and direct, setting forth the new birth as it exists in the divine intention, and as it will be, when redemption's work is accomplished, and that glorious age, called by our Lord emphatically "the Regeneration," introduced.

(*c*) Holy Scripture, when referring to Regeneration in its connection with Baptism, speaks of it as involving a "walking in newness of life," a "not serving sin," a "taking heed to please God."

(*d*) The Book of Common Prayer rehearses the blessings of Baptism as follows: ". . . our Lord Jesus Christ will vouchsafe to receive him, to

release him of his sins, to sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, to give him the Kingdom of Heaven and everlasting life . . . which promise He for His part will most surely keep and perform." Of this cluster of blessings the two final ones, "the Kingdom of Heaven and everlasting life," are perfective of the rest, and essential to Regeneration in the complete scriptural sense of the term. The fulness of perfect blessedness for all our faculties, is summed up in these great words—"The Kingdom of Heaven and everlasting life." For in Holy Scripture the phrases, "eternal life," "the world to come," and "the Kingdom of Heaven," indicate one and the same great final consummation; this is clear, both from the frequent juxtaposition of the terms, and also from their exchange, the one for the other, in the same continuous passage: See Matt. xix. 16-30, especially 16, 17, 23, 24, 28, 29, with this last verse compare St. Luke xviii. 30; St. Mark ix. 43-48. And so the Apostles' Creed has it: "I believe . . . the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting," and this is expressed in the Nicene Creed as: "And I look for the Resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come."[1] The blessing of "everlasting life" refers then to that glorious

[1] "And the Kingdom of Heaven, and the life of the world to come." The Creed in the Apostolical Constitutions.

time, after the final resurrection, when the Kingdom of God shall be fully set up, mankind wholly regenerate, and Christ reign triumphant.

Nor should the other blessings enumerated, "Vouchsafe to receive him, to release him of his sins, to sanctify him with the Holy Ghost," be so separated from the final ones as if they of themselves constitute regeneration. They are, the inseparable parts of the one promise of Christ, but still only means to the accomplishment of God's great purpose.

Observe how this Exhortation sets forth the whole mystery of Regeneration: "Dearly beloved, ye have brought this child here to be baptized, ye have prayed that our Lord Jesus Christ would

(1) "Vouchsafe to receive him, to release him of his sins."

"In Christ"—Regeneration from the standpoint of redemption. The new relation between our Lord and us; "Ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price." The Baptismal calling.

(2) "To sanctify him with the Holy Ghost."

"Like Christ"—Regeneration from the standpoint of grace. We were buried . . . with Him through baptism into death; that . . . we also might walk in newness of life. The Baptismal profession.

(3) "To give him the Kingdom of Heaven, and everlasting life."

"With Christ"—Regeneration from the standpoint of glory. Body and soul perfected in that new Kingdom for which the whole creation waits. Only this is substantial and essential regeneration. "It is enough for the servant that he be as his Master." "Where I am, there shall also My servant be."

A Summary.

The older teaching may be expressed as follows:—

Regeneration is the result of the Spirit's operation in man, which in its workings admits of measures and degrees, and while it has its roots in Baptism, it needs to be brought to bear on the whole life in its practical course, and only attains its full end when man in the totality of his being is fashioned anew—transformed into the image of Christ.

Children baptized in their infancy were looked upon as standing in a new relation to God on the ground of redemption; and since they can put no bar to the right reception of this Sacrament, in their case, therefore, apart from all conditions, God would most surely keep and perform His promise. This was considered a sufficient warrant for declaring all baptized infants "spiritually

regenerate"; and such children dying in infancy were believed to have fully attained to the promise of God. But if coming to years when morally accountable they considered that while God had begun His work of Regeneration yet henceforth it could signify nothing less than a sanctification of character, a Regeneration of mind, resulting from an unfailing reliance on the power of Christ.

In the case of adult candidates for baptism, however, repentance and faith were declared to be essential pre-requisites. Observe, for instance, the careful wording of the Exhortation in the Adult Baptismal Office: "Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe, that He will favourably receive these present persons truly repenting and coming to Him by faith." At the same time the due fulfilment of the after conditions is absolutely indispensable to a full execution of the Covenant: "Wherefore, after the promise made by Christ, ye must also faithfully for your part promise."

Now this interpretation of Regeneration, covering as it does the whole life of man and extending even to the world beyond, naturally imparts a certain indefiniteness in the use of the word which would be avoided could its meaning be narrowed down to some single act in time. Probably this apparent ambiguity is the reason why the same

divine has been quoted by so many honest men of opposite schools of thought both as maintaining and as denying Baptismal Regeneration. Certainly many of our later divines have unjustly accused the earlier ones of being unnecessarily vague in the use of the word. Thus Bishop Bethell says: "Many of our divines who maintain the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism . . . often use the word . . . to signify a man living habitually under the influence of the Spirit of Grace; unregenerate to signify a man not living habitually under that influence. Still it is to be wished that they had avoided this ambiguity of language" (Doctrine of Regeneration, Chap. I., page 12). And Robert Isaac Wilberforce, in his work on Baptism, says: "Some writers have spoken of Regeneration as a work which is only commenced in Baptism, and which is not completed till the concupiscence of our whole nature becomes extinct. Such a mode of speaking is not accordant with the usage of Scripture . . . yet it is rather an inaccuracy of expression than an erroneousness of thought" (page 43. 1846).

Undoubtedly this wider meaning of the term Regeneration, so necessary for an adequate unfolding of the doctrine both of Scripture and our own formularies, for the most part prevailed in our Church till about 1815. So

notoriously is this the case that when in that year the S.P.C.K. published one or two tracts in which Regeneration was applied exclusively to the act of Baptism, it was pointed out in a most respectful address "to the Bishops and Clergy and other members of the Society" that these tracts were in open hostility to at least fifty of the Society's previous publications; and this with other combining circumstances led, in May, 1816, to the appointment of a committee of revision for the purpose of considering whether the Society's various publications contained any doctrinal inconsistencies, and more especially upon the subject of Regeneration; and, in reference to this latter subject, their report was: "In some instances the term Regeneration is used strictly and properly, as applied in our liturgical offices to the grace conveyed in the Sacrament of Baptism, and at other times in a larger and laxer sense by different and occasionally by the same authors." It is curious and not uninstructive to observe that at about this time some of the best known publications on the Society's list were altered to make them consistent with the newer teaching concerning Baptismal Regeneration.

From that time onward it gradually came to be considered a mark of true Anglicanism to tie down Regeneration to the act of Baptism, thus

reviving the mediæval notion of grace as an infused quality (see Section IV., "Divine Grace").

At first this view of Regeneration was very carefully expressed so as not to run counter to all human experience; accordingly a sharp distinction was drawn between Renovation and Regeneration, and the latter word was frequently applied to the extinction of guilt only, and not to the re-creation of man's nature. But so artificial a limitation could not long hold its ground, and it soon came to be recognised that the restraining of the term renewal or renovation, to the improvement of a Christian already regenerate, was but the mere figment of a recent theology. With the rise of the Oxford School, however, the truer and fuller sense of the word once more reasserted itself, save that now it was absolutely tied to the Sacramental act, and Regeneration was henceforth viewed "as an act done in an instant, and accomplishing its purpose in an instant . . . that the moment after Baptism has been performed, is a period of ideal purity and excellence, from which the future life, even of a saint, is a deflection, and which those who have wandered far into sin cannot hope to recover." The result of this teaching is seen in the fact that this Sacrament has to a large extent been degraded from the high place it once occupied in the teaching office of the Church. A

belief which is essentially mechanical soon ceases to be any inspiration for life, and Baptism has in the minds of many Churchmen gradually been falling back into the position it occupied in pre-reformation days, when it was looked upon as a Sacrament inferior to Confirmation.

Section IV.

DIVINE GRACE NOT AN INFUSED QUALITY.

There is a tendency to think of God's grace as an infused quality rather than as the personal operation of the Holy Spirit. We need to remember that even Adam in Paradise could not, of himself, think a right thought nor perform a good deed (see 19th Canon of the Second Council of Orange, and St. Augustine's Enchir. d. Fid. Chapt. CV.). He was made a dependent creature, and the moment he attempted to throw aside his dependence, the same was the moment of his fall. He could think and act aright only through the Spirit of God. And is not our inherent tendency towards evil seen in the fact that we are so self-willed, presumptuous, and proud, as to desire greatly to cast off all dependence, and to be strong in our own strength, rather than in that of Him

Who giveth strength and power unto His people, and separate from Whom we have not, and cannot have, and ought not to desire to have, any strength or power at all?

As illustrating this, recall the familiar story of David and Goliath. In imagination, picture on the one side Goliath the giant, with his hard muscles and tremendous bulk. There he stands boasting of his gigantic armour and mighty strength; what are they to him but his own possession, an inheritance from his gods?

And on the other see David, the lad from Bethlehem, nought but a weak stripling, with nothing save a sling and stones. One Name, however, is on his lips, and a strength not his own, is ready to possess him; for he knows that God's strength is his, as he needs it for the work in hand.

"My grace is sufficient for thee: for My power is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my weaknesses, that the strength of Christ may cover me . . . for when I am weak, then am I strong" (2 Cor. xii. 9, 10). "I can do all things in Him that strengtheneth me" (Phil. iv. 13).

Baptized soul! cease to confess and lament that you cannot of yourself live aright; but confess and mourn over the fact that you so often try to do so in your own strength, forgetting to

seek and to use with sufficient earnestness the help that is always at your command. When we pray "Almighty God, Who seest that we have no power of ourselves to help ourselves," or, "Grant to us, Lord, we beseech Thee, the Spirit to think and do always such things as be rightful; that we, who cannot do anything that is good without Thee, may by Thee be enabled to live according to Thy will," and many such-like petitions, we use them not as confessions of sin, nor in any sense as lamentations on our part, but rather as mighty pleas with God. No utterance can be so powerful as the voice of weakness, or the cry of human need. What voice is so great a call to a man, true and brave, as the cry of a little child, or of a weak, helpless woman? And is it not the same with God in the spiritual sphere? Why, the very central point of the wonderful story of God's love in the Gospel was the pulsation of the Divine Heart to the call of human need, ere that need was expressed or even felt on the part of man.

"O Saviour, I have nought to plead,
In earth beneath or heaven above,
But just my own exceeding need
And Thy exceeding love."

Section V.

INFANT BAPTISM.

We have already seen that what Circumcision was to the Old Testament Church, the same now is Baptism to the New. It is evident that Circumcision was administered to infants; it therefore follows that we ought to baptize infants unless otherwise commanded by God. Hence the primary question is: Does the New Testament anywhere *forbid* the baptism of young children? All agree that no such prohibition can be found. On the other hand it is often asked: Is there any express mention of infant baptism in the New Testament? And while this must be answered in the negative, it is too often forgotten that the essential points are:—

1. *Infant Baptism is nowhere forbidden.* Infants had always been included in God's Covenant, and instead of a definite command excluding them, we find Baptism expressly called, "the Circumcision of Christ" (Col. ii. 11, 12).

2. *Infants are beyond doubt indirectly referred to in the New Testament in connection with Baptism.*

(*a*) In the first Christian sermon ever preached St. Peter said, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you . . . unto the remission of your sins . . . For to you is the promise, and to your

children" (Acts ii. 38, 39). The congregation was composed for the most part of Jews of the Dispersion, accustomed in their own missionary work to baptize children as well as adults, and the words must have had the effect of teaching them to act when Christians as they had already done as Jews, and baptize proselytes of every age and condition, on their admission into the Christian fold.

(*b*) We have mention of the Baptism of three households (Acts xvi. 15, 33; 1 Cor. i. 16), and the probability is that there were little children in at least one of them. The essential point, however, in the mention of household baptism, is the proof it affords concerning the continuation of God's own institution, viz., "the principle that God deals, not merely with individuals, but with households."

(*c*) 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. St. Paul here declares that Israel's crossing of the Red Sea was a figure of Baptism. The adults of the nation, with all their households, infants included, passed out of Egypt. Pharaoh desired them to leave their little ones, but they would not listen to his words, "all were baptized into Moses," all were brought thereby into intimate relationship with Moses, the typical Redeemer (compare Rom. vi. 3).

3. *Infant Baptism is in harmony with the teaching*

of our Lord and His Apostles concerning young children.

(*a*) St. Mark x. 13-17. In this beautiful story our Lord, both by word and action, declares little infants to be capable of spiritual blessing, and also proclaims that of such is the Kingdom of God—that is, the Kingdom which He came to set up (St. Mark i. 15)—a Kingdom which, as far at least as membership is concerned, is without doubt, identical with the Christian Church.

(*b*) In the Epistles we find whole Christian communities addressed, and amongst them we find children. Take, for instance, the following exhortation, "Children obey your parents in the Lord" (Eph. vi. 1). Under the Old Covenant, children were not regarded as within the Covenant merely because their parents were; unless such children were circumcised, they were "cut off from the people" (Gen. xvii. 14). And it is difficult to understand how children under the New Covenant could be spoken of as "in the Lord" if they had never received the Sacrament of "Ingrafting" (Gal. iii. 27).

4. *Infant Baptism agrees with the New Testament teaching concerning the person and work of Christ.*

The Scriptures plainly teach that in Adam all died, and that in consequence all receive through him the birth-sentence of condemnation. But Christ,

Who identified Himself with all mankind in His death, has purchased a salvation for the whole world. He is the second Adam, the Fountain-head whence mercy can for ever flow. If, in our helplessness, we receive through the first Adam condemnation, with how much greater reason should we receive through the Second Adam the blessings of redemption. Strange that there are those who, while ready to claim these blessings for their children dying in infancy (for few now deny that all children dying in their infancy are saved by Christ), yet refuse them to those infants that live, or, at least, deny to them this sacrament of their redemption (compare 2 Cor. v. 14, R.V., with Rom. vi. 3, 4).

5. *Historical evidence is in favour of Infant Baptism.*

It cannot be said that Church history affords absolutely certain proof that Infant Baptism was practised in Apostolic times. If we omit the testimony of Irenæus, since his words have been called in question, with the exception of two passages, one from Origen, the other from Tertullian, Ecclesiastical history is silent on the subject. That of Origen, however, is positive in favour of the Apostolic character of Infant Baptism. In the second, Tertullian, after his going over to Montanism, dissuades parents from baptizing their

children, except when in danger of death. Still, his words certainly show that the practice existed in his time. The testimony of history, viewed in the light of New Testament teaching, leaves little or no doubt in the mind of an unprejudiced person that Infant Baptism was practised from the first "as most agreeable with the institution of Christ" (see Godet).

CHAPTER IV.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

Section I.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

A.

IT is obvious that any enquiry into the nature of the Holy Communion must be grounded on the words used by our Lord in the institution of this Sacrament :—

St. Matthew xxvi. 26-28.
St. Mark xiv. 22-24.
St. Luke xxii. 19-20.
1 Corinthians xi. 23-25.

A careful reading over of this fourfold record of the Institution must produce in every candid mind the conviction that there is certainly nothing in the actual narratives to lead anyone to imagine that some of the words require to be severed from their connection, and interpreted as if they

were of a different character from those that precede and follow them. Take, for instance, St. Matthew's account, "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and break it; and He gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; This is My Body . . ."

The literal meaning of this account never could by any possibility excite a suspicion that the words, "Take, eat," were of one character, and the words, "This is My Body," of a totally different one; the natural meaning of the words, considered as words of institution, is plainly this—to command the use of that which Christ had first of all taken, and blessed, and broken.[1]

But what is the meaning of our Lord's words

[1] The Catechism of Trent says: "Although the Evangelist has placed the words, 'Take, eat,' before the words, 'This is My Body,' yet the former evidently express the use only, not the consecration of the matter. Wherefore they are by all means to be pronounced by the priest, but they are not necessary to the validity of the Sacrament; for otherwise it would follow, that if this Sacrament were to be administered to no one, it should not, or indeed it could not, be consecrated" (Part II., Chapt. IV., Question 20).

The Church of England, while setting aside all such attempts at tampering with the words of Institution, makes, in her Catechism, a similar deduction from the words as a whole, and therefore defines "the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper," not merely as "bread and wine," but "bread and wine which the Lord hath commanded to be received."

of institution? Is it possible to come to any conclusion as to the actual relation between the Body and Blood of Christ and the elements of bread and wine?

In seeking an answer to this question let us begin by asking: What did our Lord mean by the words, "This is My Body"?

(*a*) How are we to understand the subject—"This" (neuter)—this thing? Did our Lord mean the piece of broken bread He held in His hand?

The exact meaning of the "this," has been a matter of much debate! but beyond doubt we may set aside the interpretation which says, "The this is nothing,"[1] for both St. Luke and St. Paul agree in stating that when our Lord took the cup, He said, "This cup is the New Covenant in My Blood." There can be little question that "this cup" really means the wine contained in the cup; it is obviously therefore incorrect to say the "this" represents nothing. Besides, who could possibly read the words of St. Paul, "as often as ye eat this bread . . ." (1 Cor. xi. 26), and doubt their determinate reference to the very words of Insti-

[1] "The 'this' is nothing but the Body and the Blood; it represents nothing, it means nothing, till identified, at the close of the sentence, with the substance, named" ("Lectures on the Blessed Eucharist," by Nicholas Wiseman, page 180. 1836).

tution? While, however, we may consider it as beyond all question that the "this" refers to the bread and wine, we need not attempt to decide whether it refers to the bread and wine as consecrated[1] or unconsecrated—a question which has led to much dispute.

(*b*) What are we to say as to the meaning of the predicate, "My Body"?

Here we must not fail to observe that our Lord,

[1] There is much confusion over the question: Are the words "This is My Body" consecratory or distributive? If the distribution is set forth in the words, "Take, eat; this is My Body," then it must be acknowledged that we have no record of the actual words of consecration, and it seems to follow that the distribution of the Communion is the essential thing. If, on the other hand, the words, "Take, eat; this is My Body," are the words of consecration only, then it appears that the duty of reception is embedded in the consecration as an all-essential part of the Sacrament. The Roman Church seeks to get over the difficulty by introducing the word "for" (because). According to her teaching, our Lord took bread and blessed it, saying, "This is My Body," and then gave it to His Apostles, saying, "Take, eat; for this is My Body" (see "The Roman Missal," also "The Sarum" and other Uses of the Roman Rite).

The earliest name for the Lord's Supper is "The Breaking of Bread" (Acts ii. 42), a title which refers probably to distribution rather than to consecration. For it is worthy of remark that all the ancient and mediæval Liturgies, both Eastern and Western (except an heretical version of the liturgy of St. Basil, the Monophysite Coptic Version), never prescribe the breaking of the bread till after the Consecration. Its prescription before Consecration is peculiar to Liturgies of the Reformation era.

according to St. Luke, said, "My Body which is given for you," and that all three Evangelists say our Lord spoke in the Institution of His Blood as "shed." A true interpretation of the whole predicate demands, therefore, that we should refer the words to our Lord's Body and Blood as separated in death: to His Body as slain and His Blood as outpoured.

(*c*) What force are we to give to the copula "is"?

The meaning assigned to "is" will vary according to the meaning assigned to the subject and the predicate. This raises the enquiry—how on the night before the Crucifixion at the Last Supper, could bread and wine be called Christ's Body sacrificed and His Blood shed for the remission of sins? Or how, since the Resurrection, can it be thrown back, as it were, into the condition of being dead? (Rom. vi. 9). His crucified Body is now His glorified Body—glorified, and that for ever, because crucified once, and once for all. Beyond all question, the predicate will not bear the weight of a too literal interpretation, and recalling the fact that the copula "is" may mean "represents" or "resembles" (a meaning which it very commonly bears in Holy Scripture), it is impossible, merely from the actual words of institution, to assert anything more concerning the

bread and wine than that they represent or resemble the Lord's Body as given and His Blood as shed for the remission of sins.

At this point the question naturally arises—Is, then, the Lord's Supper only a commemorative rite? or is any gift bestowed in the reception thereof?

As the actual words of institution are few, and certainly insufficient to a full and adequate understanding of this Holy Sacrament,[1] it will be necessary before answering to consider what is taught elsewhere in the New Testament. With this purpose in view, let us refer to our Lord's own words recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John, and also to the teaching of St. Paul in 1 Cor. x.

[1] When people differ as to the meaning of words, it is well to note also the practical outcome of the various interpretations; this is often found of considerable help in forming a right conclusion. Now, it is acknowledged by all, that the outcome of what is commonly called "the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist," when perverted, is "superstition; and of the Protestant doctrine, when perverted, is profanity." The original perversion of the Lord's Supper was at Corinth, where St. Paul had long remained (with Acts xviii. cp. 1 Cor. xi. 23), and profanity was the sin of the Corinthians! To imagine the Corinthian Church could have fallen in so short a time into profaneness, if St. Paul had taught that the elements of bread and wine were actually changed into the very Body and Blood of their Lord, is well nigh incredible.

B.

THE SIXTH CHAPTER OF ST. JOHN VV. 26-64.

After the miraculous supply of food to the 5,000, as recorded in the opening verses of this chapter, our Lord (aware of the anxiety of the multitude for a similar relief of their wants, and of their disregard of that divine power from which the supply had come) began to admonish them respecting the spiritual nourishment of which they stood in need. They were seeking after "the meat which perisheth," but they ought rather to seek for that "which abideth unto eternal life." That, indeed, was the meat which He was come to give unto them, "the true bread out of heaven which giveth life unto the world." He was Himself that bread—"the Bread of Life," to be given to those who came to Him and believed on Him. "He that cometh to Me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst."

The great truths inculcated in the opening part of the discourse are obviously these:—(1) that Jesus Christ, the Son of Man, is the only source of eternal life; (2) that to hear and believe in Him are the great requisites on the part of men; and (3) that a continuous supply of life, not only in this world but reaching unto the resurrection of the

body, is the corresponding gift on the part of God the Father.

Indeed, as far at least as the opening of the 51st verse, nearly all Christians are agreed as to the meaning of our Lord's words.[1]

It is important, therefore, that we should carefully notice what follows:—Verse 51, "Yea and (*i.e.*, "this is not all" or "I tell you moreover") the bread which I will give is My Flesh, for the life of the world." These words evidently refer to the concluding words of verse 33. But how did our Lord give His Flesh for the life of the world? He gave it by suffering in it on the Cross. At this the people "strove with one another, saying, (v. 52) how can this Man give us His Flesh to eat?"[2] In reply, our Lord asserts emphatically

[1] "On the significance of His Discourse as far as the 51st verse, Protestants and Catholics are equally agreed, it refers entirely to believing in Him" ("Lectures on the Blessed Eucharist," by Nicholas Wiseman, page 39. 1836).

[2] Observe the Jews naturally gather from Christ's previous utterance, contained in verse 50, that He was referring to eating, although He had not verbally declared that His Flesh was to be eaten. Now, all are equally agreed that the eating spoken of in the previous verses is not carnal but spiritual, yet the moral condition of these people led them to draw a gross inference from the words, as, in fact, they did from the whole discourse. Christ did not, however, correct their erroneously literal interpretation of His words, and this accords with His action on other occasions, for the Gospels everywhere give undeniable witness to the

(v. 53) that on eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood eternal life depends: a life, moreover, which (v. 54) shall reach to the highest stage of communicated life, viz., the resurrection of the body; because (v. 55) His Flesh and Blood are meat and drink in all reality, and also because (v. 56) through

fact that Christ looked rather to the moral qualities than to the correct or incorrect perceptions of those with whom He had to do. Our Lord probably repeated His assertions on this occasion for the sake of those who understood and believed Him in order to strengthen their impressions, and, as regards those who misunderstood and opposed Him, as an indication that the time for explanation was past, and that they were henceforward left to the operation of their own untoward wills. Mr. Sadler, in "Church Doctrine, Bible Truth," 49th Edition, page 156, adopts some remarks of Canon Carter, who considers our Lord must have been speaking directly of the Holy Communion rather than of His Atonement, because the Jews understood the words literally, otherwise our Lord would have explained His meaning. Whatever may be the true interpretation of our Lord's words, one thing is certain, the Jews understood them in a grossly literal sense; in other words, in a way for which no Christian will for one moment contend. Nobody has ever ventured to say that the Jews could possibly have been thinking of the Eucharist, and no believer even in Transubstantiation would for one moment pretend that the literal eating and drinking of the Jews and his own Eucharistic eating and drinking are one and the same thing. It is strange that Canon Carter fails to notice that the stronger his reasons are in requiring from our Lord an express explanation of the meaning, if the literal interpretation be wrong, the more heavily do they press upon the Eucharistic interpretation of the words.

the feeding on Him a vital connection is established between Himself and the receiver ("Abideth in Me and I in him").

Finally, our Lord illustrates these wonderful words, and adds a direct appeal in which He connects the subject with all that has preceded: "As the living Father (vv. 57, 58) sent Me, and I live because of the Father; so he that eateth Me, he also shall live because of Me.[1] This is the bread which came down out of heaven: not as the fathers did eat, and died: he that eateth this bread shall live for ever."

There can be little question that this discourse shows a unity of subject (a continuity of purpose on the part of the speaker) from the beginning to the end.

Thus (1) When our Lord first mentions His Flesh, He closely connects it, in fact identifies it, with the Bread of Life on which He had so largely expatiated: "and the Bread is My Flesh" (v. 51).

[1] Notice where our Lord uses the expression, "He that eateth Me" (v. 57); surely the very use of these words here demands that we should take care not to interpret any portion of the Discourse so as to place an entire section of it in contradiction to the rest. We make this remark, as Sadler in his "Church Doctrine, Bible Truth," writes—"And here we arrive at the great turning-point in this wonderful discourse . . . for the Saviour at this point (v. 51) fixes attention on a part of Himself rather than on Himself"!

Moreover (2) All through the discourse the self-same gifts are spoken of—the one eternal life (vv. 33, 35, 40, 47, 50, 54, 58) and resurrection (vv. 39, 40, 44, 54).

And also (3) The discourse closes by a return to the same figure with which it had commenced: "This is the Bread . . . he that eateth this Bread shall live for ever" (v. 58).

But here, it may be asked, why did our Lord change the figure, and from speaking of Himself as the Bread of Life pass on, in verse 51, to speak of His Flesh and of His Blood?

Because it is not enough to view our Lord in the more general way as "the Bread of life": it is all-essential to remember Him in the more particular aspect as being the soul's nourishment in virtue of His death. We need to think of Christ, come to Christ, and trust in Christ, not merely as the Bread of God which giveth life unto the world, but as come to procure this life by His death. Our Lord was speaking on this occasion during the Passover time (v. 4), when the thoughts of all were dwelling on the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb. He would have the people regard Him, therefore, not merely as the manna vouchsafed to the Israelites for daily life in the wilderness, but

as the Lamb slain for their very existence as a nation: God's appointed way of bringing them out of the old life of bondage into the new life of service.

But though the discourse has ended, the narrative proceeds, and we learn that in the multitude were some attached to Christ (called "His disciples," verse 60) who yet, like the rest, took offence at His words, feeling the force of the enquiry—"How can this Man give us His Flesh to eat?" Their moral condition did not, however, demand that they should be left in their perplexity; Christ, therefore, seeks to lead them to a mode of thought more worthy of the subject.

Verse 61, "Doth this" (the idea of eating My Flesh) "cause you to stumble?"

Verse 62, "What then if ye should behold the Son of Man ascending where He was before?" (Would, then, a literal eating of My Flesh be possible? Must there not be an utterly different meaning in My words? How will you be able to imagine that I spoke of a carnal eating of My Flesh when you see it pass altogether away from you?)

And then Christ lays down a universal principle which should regulate all similar language. Verse 63, "It is the spirit that quickeneth" (*i.e.*, spirit only is life-giving), "the flesh profiteth nothing."

In speaking thus of "flesh," by the laws of exegesis, the word must bear the same material meaning as in the whole of the rest of the argument, and have reference, therefore, to the sacred Flesh taken by our Lord. Christ thus corrects the gross misapprehension of these disciples, declaring that for this end (life) a carnal and material eating of His Flesh would profit nothing. Our Lord, moreover, adds, "The words that I have spoken unto you are spirit and are life" (these words are emanations of My Spirit, breathing My Spirit into the souls of all true recipients of the same, as in the case of the Twelve, "Thou hast the words of," that is, which kindle in us, "eternal life," verse 68).

Beyond doubt, this chapter sets forth the Flesh and Blood of Christ offered up for the life of the world, as the one true source of spiritual nourishment to man; and that by feeding on Him a real vital union is established between Himself and the believer; but it throws little or no light on the question of the relation of the Eucharistic bread and wine to the Body and Blood of Christ. For the chapter speaks not of a physical feeding, and it would seem contrary to the whole tenor of it to regard the nourishment therein set forth as definitely located in dead matter such as the bread and wine of the Eucharist.

As this discourse was spoken before the Institution of the Eucharist, and its words are altogether absolute in their character, it can hardly be interpreted of, though it has its application to, the Lord's Supper. That it has such a sacramental application is certain, for that which our Lord thus in the synagogue at Capernaum declared in words, does He manifest in the Supper by commemorative signs—"This is My Body given for you"; "This is My Blood of the New Covenant which is shed for you." For its application to the Eucharist, see "D. The Summary."

C.

1 Corinthians x. vv. 14 to 22.

St. Paul, in warning the Corinthians to beware of idolatry, uses this argument, "Shun the slightest participation in the sacred banquets offered to idols, as this must of necessity involve an act of homage to the idol itself. For what is the meaning of those sacred banquets? Are they not solemn acts of worship to the gods in whose names they are celebrated? Do they not bring the worshipper into union with the sacrifice, and with the being to whom the sacrifice is offered?"

Verses 20, 21, "I would not that ye should have communion with devils: ye cannot" (it is a self-

contradiction) "partake of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils."

Moreover, St. Paul introduces this very argument by reminding the Corinthians that the Eucharist brings the believer under the influence of Christ: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of (or "participation in") the Blood of Christ? The loaf which we break, is it not a communion of (or "participation in") the Body of Christ? Seeing that we, who are many, are one loaf, one body" (vv. 16, 17).

Thus, according to St. Paul, the Lord's Supper is no mere simple act of profession and of memorial, but it is, on the part of the believer, a real partaking of the Flesh and Blood of Christ: the sacrament of fellowship; the divinely-appointed means of entering into communion with Christ, the living Head of His Body the Church.

Now if through the partaking of Christ's Flesh and Blood the believer enjoys living union with the living Lord, (which our Lord Himself most certainly teaches in St. John vi.), and if a real union is established between the believer and Christ through the receiving of the Lord's Body and Blood in the Supper (which is plainly inculcated by St. Paul), is there not a danger of our falling into carnal conceptions, and of forgetting how our Lord sought in His discourse at Capernaum,

to lift up the minds of His Disciples into a region wholly remote from all physical eating of His Flesh and Blood?

The whole history of the visible Church is a warning beacon pointing out how real this danger is. It is therefore, all important to remember that sacraments are but outward embodiments of the Divine Word, that they are nothing of themselves apart from the Word and Spirit of God. God is Spirit, man is spirit, and the medium of communication between God and man is Spirit. The life of the risen Lord can only become infused into the soul of man after a spiritual manner. Thus, if matter is to have access to spirit, it can only be by a connection being given to it with spirit; in other words, by matter being clothed with something which comes in contact with mind. In the Holy Communion this is done by connecting the elements of bread and wine with the words spoken by Jesus at its Institution; in this way they speak to God Himself, and also to man, concerning the one oblation of the Cross.

D.

The Summary.

The relation of the spiritual gift to the bread and wine may be expressed as follows:—

While the outward signs are never in themselves anything more than bread and wine for the nourishing of the body, yet considered in reference to this Sacrament of Christ's own appointment, they are "His Body given" and "His Blood shed" for the cleansing and nourishment of the soul; for they gather up into themselves, as it were, all that the Divine Word has spoken concerning the Death and Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ.

How different became the bow in the clouds (originating, as it does, from the effect of the sun upon a dark cloud, and therefore from the first a common and familiar object) when taken and set apart by God Himself as the Sacrament of His Covenant made with all flesh. It then embodied all that He had graciously promised in word to Noah. Doubtless, viewed in itself, the bow was merely what it had always been, and nothing more; but, considered in reference to the Lord's own appointment, how changed! God Himself has attached to it His own gracious promise, "When I see the bow I will remember My Covenant."

So, in like manner, our Lord took common objects, simple bread and wine, and after giving thanks, He broke the bread and gave the cup as the Sacrament of His Redemption. Our

Heavenly Father therefore, beholds in the bread and wine, sacramentally received, the very Body and Blood offered in sacrifice for that soul, and does thereby through the Spirit impart to the faithful receiver the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of His Son. In consequence, the soul enjoys a union with Christ, its crucified yet risen Lord; and although the Lord is in Heaven and the soul on earth, nevertheless it becomes in consequence bone of His Bone and flesh of His Flesh: it is a union between Christ and the believer as close and vital as the union of food with the living frame.

Union with Christ, intimate and abiding, with the once dead, but now ever-living and glorified Lord, is the great gift imparted through the feeding in this Sacrament on His Body and Blood. This union in all its fulness is set forth in the Lord's Supper, for it proclaims:

(1) Union with Christ as the only ground of our Justification. "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood abideth in Me . . ." (St. John vi. 56).

Christ promises to each of His people a participation with Himself in the divine favour. They are so closely identified with Him that the Father looks on Him and them as one. As Jesus was made sin for us, so are we made the righteous-

ness of God in Him. We stand before the Father not in our own character (who could so stand before the high and holy God?), but in the character of Him in Whom the Father is well pleased. And this, the believer's standing, is in virtue of his union to Christ. For, as St. Paul's says, "But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, Who was made unto us wisdom from God, both righteousness and sanctification and redemption: that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord" (1 Cor. i. 30, 31). Moreover, the same Apostle says also: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. viii. 1).

Now the Lord instituted this Sacrament in order that faith in His Atonement might become an ever-deepening possession of the heart, and the soul more and more enter into the full realisation of its complete standing in Him. Here we behold the favour of God sealed, the satisfaction by Christ confirmed, and the remission of sins established! Here we receive, through these elements of bread and wine, a sure pledge of God's grace, a sign infallible that the hand of God's saving mercy doth reach forth towards us!

O Lord Jesus Christ, my Saviour and my God, I behold in this bread, made of a substance that was cut down, ground, and bruised by men, all the

heavy plagues and pains which Thou didst suffer at the hands of sinful men. I behold in this bread, dried up and baked and burned, the fiery wrath due to my sins which Thou didst suffer that Thou mightest become to me the Bread of Life.

Let me take and eat this Bread; for though the instruments that bruised Thee be broken, and the flames that burned Thee be quite put out, yet the sweet smell of Thy oblation is ever fragrant, the Blood that flowed from Thee ever cleanseth, and Thy Word still remaineth all powerful. Lord, Thou hast said, "This is My Body given for thee" —"This is My Blood shed for thee."

(2) Union with Christ as the only source of our Sanctification. "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood abideth in Me, and I in him" (St. John vi. 56).

It has been well said "That our sanctification is the end for which we have been justified. Our moral perfection is the end for which we have been assumed into favour." We are accounted righteous before God through the merits of Christ in order to our becoming moulded into the likeness of Christ by His Spirit. United to Christ, it cannot but be that the believer is seen as in Christ, and that is his justification; and in consequence of this union it cannot but follow that Christ is increas-

ingly seen in him, which is the believer's sanctification. It is, in fact, just this moulding into the likeness of Christ (this communication of Himself in His moral character to all the members of His mystical body by the imparting of His Spirit) which is essentially included in union with Him. It is their living in the Spirit and walking in the Spirit, yea, in that very self-same Spirit of life and love by which Christ, when on earth, lived and worked and held communion with the Father.

How copiously our Lord illustrates this union, in the 15th chapter of St. John's Gospel, by the figure of a vine and its connection and communication with the branches. Its propelling through them the vital sap, and filling them with verdure and fruitfulness. Thus the oneness between Christ and His people is the ground at once of their forgiveness and acceptance, and of all the virtue and nobleness of life and conduct that can ever be theirs. Oh, to remember that a life drawn from Christ is rather Christ's life than one's own—a life having the same end and issue as His (Gal. ii. 20).

"Lord Jesus, Eternal Priest, Who ever liveth to save and to sanctify, feed me with that Living Bread which these sacramental elements of bread and wine present; and sanctify me for that eternal happiness which they promise. Make me, O Second Adam, by the Spirit a fruitful sharer in

Thy divine nature, that as the first Adam-nature pursues and reaches me, and I sin and die after his image, so henceforth I may live and grow after Thy likeness, sharing in 'the power of Thy resurrection,' until perfected in Thine image, I share in Thy Glory."

(3) Union with Christ as the only pledge of our Glorification. "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day" (St. John vi. 54).

"This is the Bread which cometh down out of heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die" (v. 50).

United to Christ, we may look forward and be sure that since we are so closely joined with Him, partakers of His merits and possessors of His Spirit, it is impossible but that where He is, there shall also His servantsbe; and as He is, so shall also His servants be. For the oneness of life will never cease in its operation until we are brought out of the bondage of corruption into the unity of His glory, "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." "If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through[1] His Spirit that dwelleth in you" (Rom. viii. 11).

[1] Or "because of" (see Godet).

There is no blessed hope of eternal life but that which results from the possession of spiritual life; and there is no spiritual life which is not conjoined with, and the product of, justified life through Christ's atoning Flesh and Blood. And because the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper commemorates that atoning Flesh and Blood, therefore does it stir within us, and nourish into mightier vigour this threefold life of Justification, Sanctification, and Eternal Glory.

It is to this final consummation that faith is directed in the very form in which our Church administers this Sacrament: "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee"—"The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee"—"preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life."[1]

Hasten, O God, the time when Thou shalt send from Thy right hand, Him Whom Thou wilt send; at Whose glorious appearing the saints departed shall be raised, and we which are alive, shall be

[1] The customary form in England during pre-Reformation times seems to have been—"The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." This form, from "The Visitation of the Sick" in "The Sarum Manual," was retained by our Reformers, with the important addition of the clause, "which was given for thee," by which the thoughts are directed to dwell on the Body slain on the Cross as the one only source of salvation.

caught up to meet Him, and so shall ever be with Him. We thank Thee, that in this Sacrament we possess even now a sure pledge of His and our glory; but with unveiled face we shall then behold Him, and be made like unto Him; and by Him, with all Thy Church, holy and unspotted, shall be presented before the presence of Thy glory, with exceeding joy. Hear us, O heavenly Father, for His sake, to Whom, with Thee and the Holy Ghost, One living and true God, be glory for ever and ever.

Section II.

THE SACRIFICIAL CHARACTER OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

It is beyond question that Christians in very early times called the Lord's Supper a Sacrifice. Surrounded as Christianity was by other religions, which, with the single exception of Judaism, had nothing to do with morality and spiritual life; starting up in their midst as a religion bare and bald, and with no appeal to sense (no temple, no altar, no sacrifice), yet Christianity declared that it had all these things in far higher form than those faiths possessed them, which had only the outward appearance. Christians, in effect, were ever saying: "innocence, justice and charity are our fat

victims," and "the best and holiest sacrifices are purified hearts and acceptable prayers." Perhaps in setting forth the fact that sacrifice can only be acceptable to God in so far as it is spiritual and rejecting all sacrifices of a merely fleshly character their language was not sufficiently guarded considering the oft-recurring tendency in man to repudiate the flesh as worthless and even evil, a danger to which the many heresies of the early Church bore ample testimony. While, however, wholly rejecting the sacrificial conception of the Greek and Roman world, and not hesitating to speak of the Jewish sacrificial system in most disparaging terms as gross and carnal (their language, indeed, appears at times difficult to understand, considering the divine origin of the Jewish system!), they nevertheless called the Lord's Supper a Sacrifice.

How was this? Because to them Life and Worship were inseparably linked together, and sacrifice was the one pervading element of both. Was not Christianity essentially sacrificial? A surrender to God and a service for man, springing out of, and receiving all its meaning from, the one sacrifice of Christ. If Christ their Lord and Master gave Himself for them, it surely belonged to them to give themselves to Him. Were they not individually and collectively by their very calling

"a kingdom of priests"? And was not the main part of their priestly function to offer spiritual sacrifices? Naturally, then, since all their worship gathered round the Lord's Supper, and sacrifice lay at its roots (it being a remembrance and pleading of Christ's sacrifice and a means of offering sacrifices of their own), they loved to speak of it as their Sacrifice.

But the use of the word was not always guarded, and their language was often open to misinterpretation, and before many centuries had rolled away sacrificial conceptions of a wholly different character took possession of the Church, and the term "sacrifice" came to be applied almost exclusively to the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper. Instead of rejecting, as the early Christians had done, everything of the nature of a fleshly sacrifice, and considering all Christian sacrifices as acceptable to God just in proportion as they are spiritual, they came to look upon the Eucharistical elements as possessing both a fleshly and propitiatory character.

No fact is better attested in history than that Archbishop Cranmer voiced the feelings of all the Reformers (viewing, of course, the Reformation on its religious side) when he wrote in his book on the Lord's Supper:—"The greatest blasphemy and injury that can be done against Christ, and

yet universally used throughout the Popish Kingdom, is this, that the Priests make their Mass a sacrifice propitiatory to remit sins," etc.

And this character we find clearly stamped upon "The Sarum Missal"—the great English pre-Reformation use of the Roman Rite. Thus, on the very threshold of the Service, these words occur: "He (the priest) shall offer the sacrifice to the Lord, saying this prayer": "Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation which I, an unworthy sinner, offer in Thy honour, Blessed Mary's, and all Thy Saints' for my sins and offences, for the salvation of the living and the repose of all the faithful departed." And at the end of Mass he is bidden to say: "Let the obedient performance of my bounden duty be pleasing unto Thee, O Holy Trinity; and grant that this sacrifice which I, unworthy that I am, have offered in the sight of Thy Majesty may be acceptable unto Thee; and through Thy mercy may it be propitiatory for me and for all those in whose behalf I have offered it."

And so all through, reference is made to the elements as a propitiatory sacrifice for sins, nor is there in the Service any other conception of sacrifice.

But when we come to the Communion Service of the First Edwardian Prayer Book, what do we find? No mention of any offering up of the

elements as a sacrifice for sins; no allusion to any propitiatory sacrifice save the only sacrifice for sins once made, wholly and exclusively, upon the Cross; the whole Service, in fact, was eviscerated of the doctrine of sacrifice as taught in the Sarum Mass.

But scarcely had this First Reformed Prayer Book come into use before a further revision was commenced—and why? Mainly because there was a party in the Church who thought they could still find traces of the mediæval Eucharistic beliefs. These men, while having renounced the Papal supremacy, clung desperately to the old doctrines. In vain they had attempted to prevent the authorisation of the First Edwardian Prayer Book, but now that it had come into use they sought to make the best of a bad case: and this they did by giving every doubtful expression in the Service a strongly mediæval interpretation, and straining every word to make it speak the language of Sarum.

Hence a further revision, the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. And this is what we see on examining it: the whole structure of the Communion Service altered, violently broken, so that any appearance of the Mass Service might be entirely wiped out. Between the Sarum Mass and Edward VI.'s First Prayer Book there was a resemblance of structure, the Reformers having in great measure retained the sequence of parts;

but now any prayer, or even word, open to mediæval interpretation, or suspected of such a meaning, was either carefully changed or wholly obliterated from the Service. And this Prayer Book, with a few alterations of no doctrinal significance (save to make the distinctive teaching of our Church clearer and more emphatic), remains to-day the one authorised service-book of the Church of England.

Let us pass on to consider the sacrificial teaching of our Communion Service; and first of all, turn to the Prayer of Consecration, and glance at its words of introduction:—

"Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, Who of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; Who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

There is little doubt that these words were inserted as our Church's protest against "the Sacrifice of the Mass," the position they occupy, the testimony of the Reformers themselves, and the language being very like that which was afterwards embodied in the 31st Article, all alike proclaim this to have been so.

But they are more than a mere protest; they

are the utterance of an all-powerful conviction that had laid hold of our Reformers. They had learnt that the soul cannot in any way atone for sin, either by sorrow or by righteousness; that it is on the finished work of Christ, and on that alone, that the soul must wholly rely; that Christ is the only Saviour from first to last; that there is a full justification for every penitent sinner through His Blood; and there is no limit to its application and all-sufficiency; or, as they themselves expressed it in the words they inserted in the Prayer of Oblation—"through faith in His Blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion."

This belief was to be henceforth the one only hope and trust of the soul, whether living or dying. It is worthy of notice that while in "The Sarum Manual de Extrem. Unc.," provision was made for a spiritual communion, the eyes of the dying were directed to the sacrifice of the Mass, and he was examined as to his belief in the act of the priest at the altar. But henceforward Christ Himself was to be set forth in the infinite merit of His Blood and Righteousness, so that the heart of the dying one might be filled with joy and peace in believing. (See Rubric in "Communion of the Sick"—"But if a man," etc.)

This belief, moreover, completely changed the whole conception as to the Church's standing before God. It is seldom noticed that the 22nd Article, treating of Purgatory and other kindred doctrines, is placed, not amongst the doctrinal articles, but amongst those dealing with questions concerning the Church. Of this Article, Bishop Harold Browne says, "It treats of the Church Invisible." The belief in the all-sufficiency of the one oblation of Christ, and the perfect access in consequence of the believer into the very presence of God, entirely revolutionised all those previous notions as to Purgatory, Pardons, and so on. "The only Purgatory," says our "Homily Concerning Prayer" (3rd part), "wherein we trust to be saved is the death and blood of Christ; which, if we apprehend with a true and steadfast faith, it purgeth and cleanseth us from all our sins, even as well as if He were now hanging upon the Cross. The Blood of Christ, said St. John, hath cleansed us from all sin. The Blood of Christ, saith St. Paul, hath purged our consciences from dead works to serve the living God. Also in another place he saith we be sanctified and be made holy by the offering up of the holy Body of Jesus Christ done once for all. Yea, he addeth more, saying with the one oblation of His blessed Body and precious Blood He hath made perfect for ever and

ever all them that are sanctified. This, then, is that Purgatory wherein all Christian men put their whole trust and confidence, nothing doubting, but if they repent them of their sins, and die in perfect faith, that then they shall forthwith pass from death to life."

Yet an attempt is now being made to undermine this glorious truth by setting forth Christ as ever offering Himself in heaven before the Father, and the Church on earth as ever offering Him in the Eucharist. "He allows us," is the strange language of Canon Mason (see "The Faith of the Gospel," p. 330. 2nd Edit., 1889), when referring to the question, "He allows us at the altar to do with Him what He Himself does in heaven." Yet, in every passage of the New Testament in which the offering of our Lord is referred to, only one truth is set forth in the phrase "offering Himself." How emphatic is the oft-repeated assertion that the offering of Christ was once made, and once for all! Indeed, the writer of the Hebrews expressly declares that our Lord's entrance into Heaven was "not that He should offer Himself often" (Heb. ix. 25).[1]

[1] Hebrews viii. 3 requires special notice. A careful consideration of this passage leaves little doubt that its teaching is in harmony with the rest of the Epistle, and refers to Christ's one oblation once offered on the Cross. The inspired writer is about

As to any offering of Christ in the Lord's Supper, Scripture is entirely silent, and it seems incredible that if our Lord had intended His Church to do this, He should not have said plainly, "Offer Me."

What, then, is this belief based on? To some extent on the words of our Lord in the Institution of the Holy Supper. There are those who consider that the "Do this" was intended to have a

to unfold the second part of his great argument concerning our Lord's High Priesthood, viz., how Christ discharges that office in relation to the true or heavenly Tabernacle. He, therefore, commences by stating the fact that no High Priest of Aaron's line could serve in what was but the earthly shadow of the true Tabernacle apart from the offering of "gifts and sacrifices"; so neither could our High Priest discharge His Office in the heavenly Tabernacle save on the ground of a previous offering of Himself: this was the one all-essential condition to His entrance,—on the fulfilment of this His whole priestly work therein must be based. "Wherefore it was necessary that this High Priest also have somewhat to offer" (that this reading is quite correct and to be preferred, see Bishop Westcott; it is worthy also of notice that it is a return to the older English Version in use prior to our Authorised Version). Observe the offering is here described as made once for all: had the writer intended to mark it as one made continuously, he would probably have adhered to the use of the present tense, which he had just employed when speaking of that made by the Aaronic high priest. Observe also that in the next verse (v. 4) not merely the high priest, but Aaronic priests in general are spoken of, implying that not the Holy of Holies only, but Tabernacle service as a whole filled his thoughts, which the entire context sets forth.

sacrificial meaning, and ought rather to be rendered, "Offer this," which again they transmute into "Offer Me": but this is untenable, of recent origin, and contrary to the teaching of all the Greek Fathers, who treat the words as meaning "Perform this action." (See an interesting article by Dr. Plummer in the Expositor, vol. 7, third series, page 441). Similarly with the word "remember," some have claimed for it a sacrificial sense, but it also was never so understood by any of the Greek Fathers.

To a much greater extent, however, this teaching is based on what has been called "the type of the old Levitical law," viz., the act of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement, entering within the veil to sprinkle the Blood. This, it is said, is fulfilled in an offering of Christ in Heaven before the Eternal Father. But what did "the veil" shadow forth? It proclaimed silently, but emphatically, that sinful man dare not, must not, approach an all holy God. It was a veil of separation: it typified the barrier between God and man. But the blood constituted a door of access on the Day of Atonement through which the High Priest could enter.[1]

[1] It is incorrect to think that the writer of the Hebrews, in chapter x., vv. 19, 20, speaks of the "veil" as the symbol of Christ's Flesh. Our Lord took matter, not to hide, but in

Now this "way," being only through the blood of an animal victim, was but for a brief interval, and he who entered by means of it was unable, through inherent sin and imperfection, to stand the all-searching gaze of the Most High. And so all that the High Priest could do was speedily to perform his work and to depart. This work was to sprinkle the Blood (to say that the High Priest went within the veil to intercede for Israel has no foundation in Scripture), which sprinkling was part of the sacrificial system of that day, and was necessary for a full shadowing forth of the Atonement. To this, the writer of the Hebrews bears witness: "The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest." Thus the offering of the blood within the veil proclaimed that the earthly tabernacle was no adequate embodiment of the Covenant, and that a perfect offering had yet to be made ere sinful man could have full access unto God.

But through the one oblation of Golgotha this has been accomplished. Did not the Blood from His riven side make a perfect way? When the veil was rent in twain every barrier was broken

order to reveal Spirit. His incarnation was a manifestation of God. "His Flesh" (*i.e.*, His rent Body) is here declared to be "the way of access through the 'barrier'" (the veil). By this ever new and life-giving way every Christian may approach boldly to the mercy seat of grace (see Bishop Westcott on the Hebrews).

down, the language of Scripture henceforth was not "Take heed lest ye come too near," but "Let us therefore come boldly"; "draw near in full assurance of faith."

Since through the sacrifice of Christ nothing now hinders the pouring in upon the hearts of believers the full sunshine of God's love, how dare we speak of offering any sacrifice for the remission of sins? All that we can do is to cast ourselves in simple faith upon God, offering Him our thanks, our praises, our acknowledgments, ourselves, for what He alone has once and for ever fully done.

The elements, therefore, in the Eucharist, speaking as they do of Christ's Body "given" and of His Blood "outpoured," are sacramental, and sacrificial only in a passive sense, the bread and the wine being signs, though not bare signs, but to faith's apprehension a real feeding on the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ.

The Prayer of Consecration having fully proclaimed the oneness of Christ's oblation goes on to clearly set forth the duty of the Church: "and did institute, and in His Holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that His precious death, until His coming again; Hear us, O Merciful Father, . . . and grant that we receiving . . ."

The words, "a perpetual memory," are full of meaning, when read in connection with the

Homily concerning this Sacrament: "But before all other things, this we must be sure of specially, that this Supper be in such wise done and ministered as our Lord and Saviour did . . . We must then take heed lest of the memory it be made a sacrifice."

But while the death of Christ is the one only true propitiatory sacrifice, nevertheless there remain other sacrifices—sacrifices of ourselves, thank-offerings to God in Christ,—which are a true Eucharist, and essentially linked to the service of Holy Communion.

Of these sacrifices no mention is made in the Sarum Mass, and it is a fact well worthy of consideration that the only idea of sacrifice which pervades Roman theology and worship is that of expiation. Take, for example, Thomas Aquinas' definition of sacrifice. "The term Sacrifice," he says, "is properly applied to anything done for the honour properly due to God with the view of propitiating Him." And in the letter put forth by the English Roman Catholic Bishops in vindication of the Papal Bull on Anglican Orders (1896), we find words to the same effect. Here is a short summary: "A certain kind of sacrifice divines of your Church have always claimed, though not according to the Catholic sense of the term sacrifice. With you

the word is used in a figurative sense, while with us the only sacrifice is the Body and Blood of Christ sacrificed and offered by the priesthood."[1]

[1] Our Archbishops had said in their answer to the Papal Bull on Anglican Orders, "We truly teach the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice . . ." (Section 11, page 18, 1897). This led the English Roman Catholic Bishops to make the above remarks, and also to say: "It seems to us that, as the object of your Letter was to make plain for all time the doctrine of your Church on the subject of Holy Orders, and this point about the . . . true sacrifice lies at the very roots of that controversy, we are entitled to ask you to remove the doubt which has arisen in the way described, and tells us in unmistakable terms what your real meaning is" ("Vindication," page 81. 3rd Edit. 1898).

The reading of the above recalls to the present writer an interesting article on "Sacrifice" which appeared in the "British Magazine" for 1846 (this publication inculcated the old High Anglican type of divinity—Hugh James Rose was at one time Editor), and in which occurs the following: "The Romanist maintains that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, and he charges us with denying it. What does he mean? He means that it is a real and actual propitiation and expiation. He means that it is a sacrifice in the sense in which the term sacrifice is applied to the death of Christ. He says that we deny this. What effect is likely to be produced on his mind by our saying, that we do not deny it to be a sacrifice, and then going on to qualify the word sacrifice . . .? We may, indeed, drive him into a corner . . . but the effect on his mind must be, that we are either practising evasion and taking refuge in ambiguities—or else, that we are afraid to deny in terms, a doctrine which we have not the courage to avow. We should do well to consider, whether we do not compromise the truth by any other answer than by a denial in terms" (Vol. 30, page 721).

How different is the language of Holy Scripture concerning these sacrifices of which Rome speaks so slightingly! According to Scripture they are "sacrifices of righteousness," "sweet-savour offerings," "well pleasing to God."

Now under the old Dispensation there were different orders and species of sacrifices; and of these orders there were two: Sacrifices of Righteousness, and Sacrifices of Propitiation.

The Sacrifices Propitiatory (the Sin-offering, and the Trespass offering) had for their motive "forgiveness"; they expressed the attitude of a soul seeking restoration to fellowship with God.

The Sacrifices of Righteousness (the Burnt offering, the Meat offering, and the Peace offering) had nothing to do with sin (*i.e.*, with any special and formal acts of transgression), they were "sweet-savour offerings," their motive was for "well-pleasing," they expressed the true attitude of a soul in communion with God.

So far, therefore, as the Church of God is concerned, Sacrifices of Righteousness must always stand in the first and foremost place, for the chief aim in the life of a regenerate soul must ever be, to do the Divine will, and so to please God.

Accordingly, the Burnt Offering, as setting forth this truth, was the daily and continual offering of Israel. Every morning there was the Burnt

Offering, and scarcely had this been consumed ere the evening offering began, which lasted till the next morning. Thus Israel as the redeemed of Jehovah, was never without the sacrifice which expressed her self-oblation, her corporate dedication to God.

Sacrifices of Righteousness must, of course, have tended to deepen the conception of sin, for never could the Burnt Offering have ascended without the true Israelite being reminded of shortcomings and imperfections which perpetually cleave to the soul and mingle with its best services; nor could the Peace Offering ascend without reminding of unfitness to rejoice before God in peace and gladness. In this aspect only were they sacrifices of atonement, hiding the record of debt, and clearing the offerers from obligation.

As sacrifices of righteousness they never did nor ever could receive any complete fulfilment, save in the Righteous One, Who in the full and perfect dedication of Himself to fulfil the Divine will, was the true Burnt Offering; in that incessant devotion and practical service which He displayed both in life and death, the true Meat Offering; and in His habitual thankfulness and joy, the true Peace Offering.

In the same way with sacrifices of propitiation; He Who alone was without blemish, could offer

these so as to exhaust their meaning for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him, "that we being dead to sins should live unto righteousness."

"Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me." . . . "Then shalt Thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness." (Ps. li. 7, 10, 19).

Now the sacrifices of righteousness, shadowed forth in Old Testament type, and fulfilled in Christ Jesus, are, in virtue of our union with Him, obligatory upon us. Observe how they are brought before us in our Communion Service.

(1) In the Church Militant Prayer we read, "Accept our alms and oblations." The rubric before this prayer directs that the persons who shall have received the alms for the poor and other devotions of the people, shall reverently bring the basin containing them to the priest, and he shall humbly present and place it upon the Holy Table. All these additions were made to the rubric at the last revision of the Prayer Book, and at the same time the word "oblation" was added to the prayer itself.

Clearly all this was done to emphasize the fact that alms to the poor and oblations to the Church

are a true and proper sacrifice. Listen to the testimony of Scripture: "But I have all things, and abound: I am filled, having received from Epaphroditus the things that came from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God" (Phil. iv. 18). "But to do good and to communicate forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased" (Heb. xiii. 16).

The question will naturally be asked, Are we under these "oblations" to include the bread and wine? In early times they were so, being free-will offerings in memory of Creation and Redemption, a portion of them was set apart for Holy Communion, and the rest bestowed in charity. In course of time, however, these offerings were commuted for money, with which the Eucharistic elements were purchased by the Church's officers. This is so amongst us now; the bread and wine are in no sense free-will offerings on the part of the people. But do we realize sufficiently that our offerings are true and proper Gospel sacrifices, which must be presented to God as gifts from His children, who are to act as their Father in Heaven does, from an internal spring and principle of love? What a reproach this is to our modern Church life! Could we have fallen so low if we had laid the foundation of our gifts in deep devotion to God, and ever plainly taught that

they are, in Christ Jesus, "sweet-savour offerings well pleasing to God"?

(2) We will now briefly consider the opening words of the prayer commonly called the Prayer of Oblation: "O Lord and Heavenly Father, we, Thy humble servants, entirely desire Thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

The expression, "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" (it occurs also in the Thanksgiving Prayer for "Restoring Public Peace at Home"), clearly refers to the whole service. "It is not the sacrifice of Christ which we here speak of," says Dean Comber, "for that is always pleasing to God, and was absolutely perfect; it is our own peace offering in commemoration thereof, in which there have been many failings, and therefore we desire and beg that it may be accepted in mercy, so that our infirmities may not deprive us of the benefit and comfort thereof."

Our participation in Christ involves the expression of thanksgiving and of praise to God, for "through Him then let us offer up," says the writer of the Hebrews, "a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to His Name."

Oh, that the Church had alway remembered that the Eucharist is the great obligatory praise-

offering of the people of God, that while our thanksgiving springs from an individual realization of the fact that He "loved me, and gave Himself for me," this thankfulness must expand and soar upward in united praise that the whole Church may rejoice together in Communion.

(3) Glance for a moment at the other reference to sacrifice made in this prayer: "And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice unto Thee."

These words of self-dedication also occur in one of the special thanksgivings to be used either in the Litany or at Morning and Evening Prayer. It is the natural outcome of thankfulness, therefore most appropriate indeed essential to a true Eucharist. "I beseech you, therefore, brethren by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, wholly, well pleasing to God, which is your reasonable service" (margin "spiritual worship" Rom. xii. 1). On the ground of Christ's finished work the Apostle invites us to lead the life of consecrated victims (living victims), so as to become at every moment of our existence the active agents of the Divine Will. Could there be a more fitting occasion than at Holy Communion? Here the Church is engaged in showing forth the Lord's death, and in the very attitude of enjoying

fellowship with God. She therefore, as a corporate body, makes a dedication of herself, without reserve, in order to fulfil His Will.

Oh, that our lives may be more and more sacramental lives—outward and visible signs of God's inward and spiritual grace, that we may daily learn to offer that sacrifice in place of which nothing can be accepted by Him, viz., the yielding up of ourselves to Him, asking only to be the channels of His Holy Will.

Section III.

THE ADORATION OF CHRIST IN THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The New Testament teaches that every act of participation in the Lord's Supper is peculiarly an act of worship to Christ as God (1 Cor. x.): and thence it is that from the earliest times the worship of Christ has ever held a prominent place in the Eucharistic Service of the Church.

Accordingly we give utterance to this exulting burst of adoration: "O Lord, the only begotten Son Jesu Christ; O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us . . ."

This original feature of the Communion Service was however in later times corrupted into a

worship of Christ in connection with the consecrated elements. Our Church in consequence, while ordering the communicants to receive the consecrated elements kneeling, has been careful to guard the posture thus enjoined, from being "misconstrued and depraved" (see the Declaration on Kneeling at the end of the Communion Service),[1] as though it intended or allowed any

[1] This Declaration was added to the Prayer Book of 1552. It was omitted in 1559, although "it continued to be most diligently declared, published and impressed upon the people." (See "Zurick Letters," Vol. I., p. 180. Park. Soc.) When reinserted in 1662 one alteration was made, the word "corporal" was substituted for "real and essential" presence. There is little doubt, however, that in 1552 "real presence" and "corporal presence" were considered identical in meaning. Thus in the Articles of 1552, Article 29 contained the following: "It becometh not any of the faithful to believe or profess that there is a real or corporal presence (as they phrase it) of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist." Before 1662 this phrase "real presence" had come to be used by Church of England Divines as expressing a real reception of Christ by the faithful in the Lord's Supper, in contra-distinction to the Lord's Supper being only a teaching ceremony with inoperative signs of Christ's death.

Undue stress has been laid on the fact that the above alteration made in 1662 was due to Peter Gunning, afterwards Bishop of Ely (see Commentary on the Prayer Book by Leighton Pullan), a Bishop who in spite of the Eucharistic beliefs imputed to him did not hesitate to make the Declarations contained in the 25th and 30th of Charles II. (see Section V. of this Chapter) against Transubstantiation and the idolatry of the Mass, and to teach others to do the same. (See the testimony of Burnet and Evelyn.)

adoration to or towards the consecrated elements. She declares emphatically "that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done," and hesitates not to add, that such adoration of the consecrated elements is "Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians"; and this for two reasons.

(1) Because the bread and wine remain in their natural substances.

(2) Because Christ's Body and Blood are in Heaven, and not here.

It is worthy of remark that this declaration does not say merely we must not adore bread and wine remaining in their natural substances—who ever believed such wicked folly? *But we must not adore because they so remain.*

Article 28 declares "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped,"[1] "thereby ostensibly signifying that to do such things is forbidden by the Gospel."

[1] It ought not to be forgotten that our Church, in order to avoid the danger of any worship being directed towards the consecrated elements, so altered the structure of the Communion Service in 1552, that since then the administration has followed immediately upon the consecration of the elements without any prescribed act of worship intervening.

Section IV.

THE ORDER FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER OR HOLY COMMUNION.

A Brief Meditation.

Four writers of the New Testament give the Institution of the Holy Supper—St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul.

St. John, penning his Gospel after the Breaking of Bread had become the universal practice of the Church, was led to narrate many of the events which happened on the night of holy Institution, and especially the wonderful discourse delivered by Jesus at the Supper Table. Now these events, six in all, may be looked upon as forming the framework of our Service. Let us view it in the light of this thought. We shall not attempt to give the events in their chronological order; this of itself would be no easy matter! but in the order corresponding to the different parts of our Communion Office.

First, the solemn scrutiny.

The devil had put it into the heart of Judas to betray our Lord. The Lord, knowing all hearts knew who the traitor was, and said, "Verily I say unto you one of you shall betray me." Great heart searching followed these words! All had

tasted of Christ's wondrous love; no one liked to think that he himself could be guilty of such an act. In very sorrow each one asked, "Lord, is it I? Is it I?" There was, however, one exception—Judas. He had become so hardened that this outgoing of pity on the part of Jesus in letting him know that He knew all, tended only to make him all the more fierce; and he leaves the Supper Room the more determined to carry out the wicked deed.

And our Communion Service begins with a like solemn scrutiny. At its very commencement, we are reminded that to Him into Whose Presence we are come "all hearts are open, all desires known, and from Him no secrets are hid." "I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins." "Are there not with you, even with you, sins against the Lord your God?" (Jer. xvii. 10; 2 Chron. xxviii. 10). After this prayer, God's Law is read in our hearing, that Law by which is the knowledge of sin. Do our hearts respond in contrition, Lord, it is I? Have mercy on me, and incline my heart to keep Thy Law.

"Let a man prove himself and so let us eat of the bread, and drink of the cup." There is a danger of not being sufficiently watchful over self, of coming to the Holy Table without preparation. Watch and pray. Beware of your own heart.

"Search me, O God, and know my heart." "By Thy Word and Commandment read me." Remember there must be an opening of each of our hearts to Him "from Whom no secrets are hid": "Lord, is it I?" must be asked as in His Presence, and those of us to whom it is answered "Thou hast said," must repent, or come not to this Holy Supper.

The second event is the discourse of the 14th, 15th, and 16th chapters of St. John, and to this correspond the Epistle, Gospel, Creed, and Sermon of our Communion Service.

The Sermon has always been considered as part of the Communion Service, according to the example of our Lord and His Apostles. Thus we read in the 20th chapter of the Acts, "When the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them." It is worthy of notice that the ancient custom of saying, after the announcement of the Holy Gospel for the day, "Glory be to Thee, O Lord," carries our thoughts back to the Supper Room. For our Lord prefaced His Gospel (the good news then spoken to comfort the troubled hearts of His disciples) with a like utterance of glory—"Now is the Son of Man glorified and God is glorified in Him. Little children . . ." (St. John xiii. 31).

The third event is the feet-washing. We have

had the anxious inquiry, that heart-searching question—"Lord, is it I?" We have made profession of our faith in the Creed, and have listened to God's Word read and preached. We have joined also in "the fellowship of almsgiving" (Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. viii. 4), and in two prayers, one for the Sovereign and one "For the whole State of Christ's Church Militant here in earth," according to St. Paul's direction in his 1st Epistle to Timothy: "I exhort therefore that first of all prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men: for Kings, and for all that are in authority."

Now is about to commence the most solemn part of the Service, that part which corresponds to the feet-washing. We read in the 13th chapter of St. John, "Supper being ended . . . He riseth . . . and took a towel and girded Himself; after that He poureth water into a bason and began to wash the disciples' feet." In other words, having eaten the Passover with them, our Lord proceeds to welcome them, "as a Son over His own House," to a better feast. For, to be consistent with Eastern custom, the feet-washing must have meant such an invitation and admission. The inner meaning of it all was hidden from them, but that they were to know afterwards. Nevertheless, in the light of what our Lord said and

did, they must have perceived that something very solemn was about to happen.

Briefly consider the teaching set forth in this action. The Lord Jesus rises from the Paschal Table and begins to wash the disciples' feet. St. Peter, thinking that it was merely the outcome of his Master's deep humility, resents it. Jesus, however, intimates that a deeper meaning lies beneath the surface. "If I wash thee not," He says, "thou hast no part with Me." Seeing something of the truth intended, St. Peter at once replies, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head."

But this entire washing (symbolising "the new birth," "the washing of Regeneration"), was not that which our Lord desired to figure forth. He therefore replies, "He that is washed (bathed) needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean" (v. 10). In these words our Lord seems to say, "Remember a bather on leaving the water contracts fresh defilement in every step he takes along the sandy shore or dusty road, and therefore needs to wash his feet, though he be clean every whit: so My disciple, though he has already 'washed away his sins, calling on My Name'; yet needs a continual cleansing from the defilement which must ever arise from contact with an evil world without,

and a sinful nature within" (see 1 John i. 7).

So now in our Service comes first the Invitation which was clearly hinted at in the feet-washing: "Ye that do truly and earnestly repent of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbours . . . draw near with faith." The Saviour invites you to have part with Him at His Table. "Come, for all things are now ready." But before doing so, the Invitation adds, "Make your humble confession to Almighty God, meekly kneeling upon your knees." These closing words bring us face to face with the deep inner meaning of the feet-washing, the need of cleansing from sin. Confession and pardon must ever precede Communion: forgiveness is the gate to fellowship, and so the Confession, Absolution, and Comfortable Words follow.

[Notice, by the way, that the phrase, "the burden of them is intolerable," means—our sins are a burden which we shall never be able to bear—a burden which, if God Himself does not remove, will press us down for ever.]

(4) Next we give ourselves unto praise; and this division of our Service includes the "Sursum Corda," the "Preface," and the "Ter Sanctus," and corresponds to the psalm sung by Jesus and His disciples in the Supper Room.

As soon as we hear the words, "Lift up your hearts," at once let us abandon all thoughts of

sin, self, the world, in fact everything but God, and immediately reply, "We lift them up unto the Lord." What is it which binds the soul down to earth? Is it not sin, and a sense of sin? What can snap that cord? Is it not a knowledge of God's forgiveness? Our sins have already been confessed—God's forgiveness has been pronounced—the feet-washing has indeed taken place, "Already ye are clean, because of the Word which I have spoken unto you" (St. John xv. 3). Well may we then when we hear the words, "Let us give thanks unto our Lord," at once answer, "It is meet and right so to do." Let our minds be set on things above, and "with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of Heaven let us laud and magnify His glorious Name."

(5) And now we are to draw near the Holy Table, to show forth the Lord's Death by eating of the bread and drinking of the cup, but before doing so, there is said "in the name of all them that shall receive the Communion this prayer following": "We do not presume to come to this Thy Table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in Thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under Thy Table." These words are the reminder of an event that took place on the way to the Supper Room.

Strangely enough, the Paschal Supper began with a contention who should be accounted the greatest, and have the first place, and it would seem that Judas gained it!

As brethren, and disciples of Christ, we are about to take our place at God's Board; instead of asking for the chief place, we acknowledge that in ourselves we are not even worthy to take the place of dogs, and to pick up the crumbs under His Table: that our approach is only through His "manifold and great mercies," and because "He is still the same Lord, Whose property is always to have mercy." Humility is the first and last lesson in the school of Christ; how we need to learn this! How we love to speak of the things which we have done, when in reality we have grievously and shamefully fallen short! How often we indulge in small jealousies; what selfishness there is in us; what secret delight in human applause; what high opinion of our own powers and talents, however weak and inefficient they may be; how we need constant supplies of grace to make us humble and keep us so.

Lord, root out of us that deadly weed of pride which is so hateful to Thee and so destructive to our souls. Give us, Blessed Lord, that humble and lowly mind which dwelt in Thee; and in all our approaches to Thy Table, may we come clothed

with humility and treading in Thy steps, that we may enter into true fellowship with Thee and with the brethren.

After the prayer setting forth the attitude in which we should approach the Lord's Table, the Communion follows. The words of Institution are recited in the Prayer of Consecration, and we then have fellowship with our risen Lord and with one another.

(6) When all have communicated, the Lord's Prayer is said, and one of two prayers—the Prayer of Oblation or the Prayer of Thanksgiving. After which the "Gloria in Excelsis" follows. All this portion of our Service corresponds to the Prayer of our Lord in the 17th chapter of St. John.[1] Our Blessed Lord prayed for the oblation of His people on the ground of His own Oblation, and also for their glorification as their Glorified Head. Then we "depart with this blessing"—"The peace of God . . ." Our Lord's last words at the Supper Table were a benediction of peace."

[1] Compare vv. 13-17, and especially v. 19, of this chapter with the Prayer of Oblation. Also vv. 11, 12, 18, 20, 21, 25 and 26 with the Prayer of Thanksgiving. And with the "Gloria in Excelsis," vv. 3-6, 10, 22 and 23. Why do we say, "We *thank* Thee for Thy great glory," rather than "We *praise* Thee . . ."? Because our Lord says, "The glory which Thou gavest Me I have given them" (v. 22).

Section V.

THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH CATHOLIC AS TO THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE.

What was the belief in early times as to the relation between the gift bestowed in the Eucharist and the consecrated elements of bread and wine? For, whatever individuals may believe, the Church unquestionably has always held that a gift is bestowed in the Lord's Supper.

One thing is certain, in the early Church there was no authoritative teaching on this question, and the peculiarities of language and the different types of thought among various writers make the matter by no means easy of a final decision. Whose are the Fathers? is still open to debate, and who shall settle so interminable a controversy? As illustrating this, it is worthy of remark that Dr. Pusey, a great student of patristic literature, considered the doctrine of the early Church as to the Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist was best defined by the terms "Real Objective Presence," that is to say, a Presence of Christ supernaturally united to the elements through consecration and apart from reception. Dr. Pusey concluded thus more particularly on the ground of what St. Augustine taught; and although, to

use his own favourite phrase, he "lived in St. Augustine," so that his whole thought became saturated with that of the African Father, many doubted the correctness of his judgment, and seemed to prove conclusively that Augustine taught no such doctrine!

Since then Bishop Gore, a pupil of Pusey's, has come forward, and after applying the principles of "exegesis" to the writings of Augustine, declares his teaching on the Eucharist to be obscure, but that, taken as a whole, "it may fairly be interpreted on a receptionist theory like Hooker's" ("Dissertations," page 232)[1]; *i.e.*, our Lord is present in the Eucharist, not in, nor with the bread and wine, nor under their accidents, but to the faithful in the due receiving of the same.

Now we must recollect that St. Augustine's teaching was never called in question, and also that, to use the words of Bishop Gore, "in the

[1] This very marked difference in judgment is probably due to the fact that Dr. Pusey and Bishop Gore approach the matter from an entirely different standpoint—Bishop Gore is essentially a critic, but Dr. Pusey "was not given to discriminating when he had before him the words of the Fathers" ("Church Quarterly Review," No. 78, page 341). This is acknowledged as the great drawback to his volume on the Real Presence (see "Pusey's Life," Vol. III., page 65). Yet how many have fully and unreservedly followed Pusey in his conclusions based on what he believed to be the teaching of the Fathers!

great theological revival which marked the empire of Charles the Great and his successors, the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist became for the first time an explicit subject of controversy. The theologians of the beginning of this period mostly follow Augustine on the subject. Thus, Alcuin (Albinus Flaccus) repeats, in his commentary on St. John, the receptionist language of Augustine" ("Dissertations," page 234). We may fairly, then, consider that whatever may have been the speculations of certain individuals, the general teaching of the early Church was "Receptionist."

The first Eucharistic controversy (8th and 9th centuries) died out leaving the question unsettled; it was, however, rekindled in the Berengarian Controversy of the 11th century, the result being that in the end Transubstantiation became accepted as a dogma of the Western Church, which it was heresy to deny, though the actual word Transubstantiation does not occur in any ecclesiastical decision till it was decreed as of the Catholic Faith by the Lateran Council in 1215.

The Church of England speedily re-echoed the teaching of Lateran,[1] and Transubstantiation

[1] It is worthy of notice that two questions not in the Roman Pontifical, nor in the early English Pontifical (Tiberius, C.I.) of the eleventh century, were introduced about this period into the Sarum and Winchester Pontificals:

was declared as part of the faith in the Constitutions of Durham and of Exeter, and the events of 1413 place it beyond all question as part of the authoritative teaching of the Pre-Reformation Church of England.

Moreover, since the Synod of Bethlehem (1672), "Transubstantiation" has become a definite term accepted by the "Orthodox" and Russian Churches of the East;[1] it may, therefore, be said

Question 1. Dost thou believe that the bread which is placed on the Lord's Table is only bread before the consecration, but that in the consecration by the unspeakable power of the Godhead, the nature and substance of bread is turned into the nature and substance of the Flesh of Christ, truly the flesh of no other than of Him Who was conceived of the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary?

Answer: I believe.

Question 2. And likewise that the wine which with water mixed is placed in the chalice for sanctification is truly and essentially turned into the Blood which the soldier's lance flowed from the wound in the side of the Lord?

Answer: I believe.

Thus a belief which was once judged absolutely necessary for admission to the ministry is now declared by our Reformed Church to be an absolute disqualification (see Article 28)!

[1] It is much questioned whether the Greek Church explains the theory of Transubstantiation in the same way as the Roman Church. Dr. Pusey did not hesitate to say that "the belief of the Greek Church is the same as ours on the meaning of the word Transubstantiation . . . Archbishop Plato, in the Greek Church, admits the term in a sense which, if proposed to it, the English Church must accept . . . A sacramental and hyper-

to express the authoritative belief of (what is commonly called) "Unreformed Christendom."

The Churches of the Reformation.

All the Reformed Churches agreed together in rejecting Transubstantiation, but they unanimously taught a real reception of Christ in the

physical change no English Churchman, who believes the Real Presence as his Church teaches, could hesitate to accept" ("An Eirenicon," page 25, 1865). But this is to forget that the very Parliament which gave its sanction to the present Book of Common Prayer required of all the Bishops and of all the laity occupying any civil or military post the making of the following declaration:—

"I (A.B.) do solemnly and sincerely in the presence of God profess, testify, and declare that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ at or after the Consecration thereof by any person whatsoever. And that the Invocation or Adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly in the presence of God profess, testify, and declare that I do make this Declaration and every part thereof in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever." 25th and 30th Charles II. (1673-1678).

By the Bill of Rights (1689) the above declaration is still required to be made by every English Sovereign, although since the year 1829 it had not been demanded of the Bishops or laity of the Church.

Supper,[1] although they limited the sacramental effect to reception, believing that a Sacrament has no effect beyond the use assigned to it in the Divine Institution.

The Lutheran Church, however, separated from the rest of the Reformed Churches on the question: Is the reception a moral or a physical one? that is, is the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Supper dependent on the moral condition of the receiver? or is it one in which all alike receive, although the good alone to soul-profit? Although Luther declared for a material reception, he allowed no Presence but in communion, citing 1 Cor. x. 16 as signifying that the Body of Christ is present only in the breaking and eating.[2]

The Church of England, however, like the rest of the Reformed Churches, not only rejects Transubstantiation, but also teaches that the reception of Christ in the Supper is a moral not a physical one: "The Supper of the Lord . . . is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's Death: inso-

[1] What is called "Zwinglian doctrine," although doubtless held by many individuals, was never the authoritative teaching of any of the Reformed Churches.

[2] The Lutheran doctrine is speculative, not practical; it does not, as is the case with Transubstantiation, "give occasion to many superstitions" (see Article XXVIII.), it is therefore no true ground for separation from the Lutheran Church.

much that to such as rightly, worthily and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ" (Article 28).

The 29th Article is entitled: "Of the wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper," an Article full of meaning, especially when one recalls the many controversies which gather round the teaching it enshrines.

It is worthy also of observation, and few who have really considered the matter will call it in question—that the divines of the Reformed Church of England, when their testimony is impartially weighed, are found to be almost unanimous till about 1833, in teaching a Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, not in, or with the elements, but to the faithful only in the due receiving of the same.

Section VI.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE ACCORDING TO THE ROMAN CHURCH AND THE "OXFORD MOVEMENT."

The Roman Church teaches that our Lord Himself, Risen and Glorified, is really, truly, and

substantially present under the species of bread and wine, yet not like an ordinary, visible material body, in a way which is extended (having length, breadth, and thickness), measurably, or occupying certain dimensions of space. See Council of Trent (Session 13, Chapter I.), also the Catechism of Trent (Part II., Chapter IV.).

Accordingly, while the Roman Church teaches that Christ is substantially present not only at the right hand of God, and also in the Eucharistic elements, whenever they are consecrated, or reserved, it would be contrary to her doctrine to say that Christ is "locally present" in the sense of filling up some measurable quantity of space. By being "locally present" she understands, that which corresponds to the idea of "here" or "there."

Again, while the natural Body of Christ is, according to Roman teaching, substantially present in the Eucharist, the method of its existence under the sacramental species, is not, she teaches, the same as at the right-hand of the Father. In each it is the same natural Body, although "the mode of its existence is in one case 'natural'" and in the other "sacramental."

Christ too, so Rome teaches, is corporally present in the Eucharist, in the sense that it is Christ's true and natural Body that is present

there, yet not after the manner of ordinary bodies, having size and dimensions and extension of parts, but "whole in every part." [1]

The nature of the Eucharistic presence of necessity occupies the first and foremost place, but immediately afterwards arises this question—

[1] It is obvious that the Roman doctrine of a Real Objective Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, demands some such statements as the above if the fact of the Lord's Ascension from earth to Heaven in that very Body in which He rose from the dead, and with which He shall come again, is not to be obscured. This necessity is well pointed out in a charge delivered by the Bishop of Argyll and the Isles (Dr. Chinnery-Haldane), who, accepting the Roman doctrine at the same time, recognises the importance of the decrees of Trent on this question: and adds, "We must be very careful, in short, in all that we say about the Blessed Sacrament, to distinguish between our Lord's hidden Presence under the forms of bread and wine, and His unveiled manifestation of Himself in that Heaven of Heavens to which He ascended forty days after His Resurrection."

Yet all such distinctions so subtle in their character (to some they appear wholly unintelligible, and to others a virtual denial of the true verity of Christ's Ascension Body) tend to confuse the mind, and to lead to utterances of a seemingly contradictory character! Thus even Roman Catholic Theologians have not hesitated to deny that Christ is present in the Eucharist either corporally or locally. For instance, Thomas Aquinas speaks of the Body of Christ as not "locally" present, and Bellarmine of Christ's Body as not "corporally" present! For a curious example of how it is possible even to dress up the Roman doctrine of the Presence in a Protestant garb, see the "Report of Conference held at Fulham Palace in October, 1900" (pages 68, 69).

What is the exact relation of this Eucharistic Presence of Christ to the elements of bread and wine?

Rome declares that Transubstantiation expresses this relationship, and that at the words of consecration, the substances of bread and wine disappear, and instead thereof Christ Himself is present, under the accidents of bread and wine. Now to understand the exact doctrinal difference between this teaching of Rome and the Oxford Movement these two things must be kept distinct:

(1) The nature of the Eucharistic Presence,

and (2) The connexion of this Eucharistic Presence with the elements of bread and wine.

(1) As regards the nature of the Eucharistic Presence the teaching of the Oxford Movement is in perfect accordance with that of Rome. Thus Dr. Pusey wrote: "The same Body which is locally at the Right Hand of the Father is supra-locally under a different mode of existence present with us really, truly, substantially, though spiritually. And since His Body is there, there must His Soul be also, there also His Divinity. For they are inseparable. And all this for us . . . ere He left earth, He contrived a way whereby He should be continually present on earth, pre-

sent, not as when on earth, in one single place, but throughout the whole earth, wherever Christians are, for Him to come to, wherever, according to His Holy Institution, His words consecrate the oblations to be His Body and Blood" ("Address during a Retreat of the Companions of the Love of Jesus," page 66).

(2) But while Rome and the Oxford Movement teach one and the same doctrine concerning the Eucharistic Presence of Christ, they differ as to what is the exact relation of this Eucharistic Presence to the consecrated elements of bread and wine. The theory of Transubstantiation as setting forth this relationship the leaders of the Oxford Movement reject, on the ground that it is an attempt to explain the matter in the terms of an exploded philosophy, and is involved in many difficulties of a metaphysical character.

And therefore instead of affirming a belief in the annihilation of the elements, the leaders of this movement, declare that in some manner wholly ineffable, and beyond the cognizance of the senses, this presence of Christ is supernaturally united to the elements; that in virtue of the words of consecration, and wholly distinct from the faith of the recipient, the Body and Blood of Christ are present under the veils of bread and wine.

Obviously this divergence between Rome and the Oxford Movement cannot be described as a difference of religion, but rather of philosophy; indeed as regards religious belief it is purely a question of phraseology. Thus even the "Church Quarterly Review" says: "We have no love for the word 'Transubstantiation.' Rather we recognise in its history very solid reasons against choosing it to express our belief. Still, we are bound to say that, if it should be clear (as is certainly not the case at the present time) that the great object of the external reunion of Christendom could be furthered by the adoption of the word, and if it should be possible for us to accept the word without accepting the philosophy which it has generally been understood to denote, as has been the case in the East; it would then, we think, be unnecessarily stickling for what had become a mere matter of phraseology if we were to refuse the word" (No. 82, page 331).

Now nothing is more certain than that the first compilers of the Book of Common Prayer not only rejected and expunged all statements which were thought to teach the Roman doctrine of the Presence, but considered the matter of so vital a character that they protested against it even unto death. It is worthy of notice that the Articles of Accusation in the most prominent cases of

martyrdom in connection with our English Reformation have been preserved, and we find them again and again to turn on the denial of the Roman doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence of Christ in first place, and the denial of Transubstantiation only in the second. The first stands as the prominent charge, in many cases the whole charge; and the other was but the sequel to it. It was not so much against Transubstantiation as against the Roman doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence of Christ that the English Reformers protested to the death.

AN APPENDED NOTE.

Bishop Gore *on the Eucharist.*

Since the above was written a book has appeared entitled "The Body of Christ," by Charles Gore, now Bishop of Worcester. The longest and most important chapter is that in which the Bishop deals with "The Gift and Presence in Holy Communion" (chapter 2).

In this chapter the idea most fully developed is the one which is spoken of as "the relativity of the Presence." This the Bishop explains as follows: "In other words the Eucharistic Presence because it is spiritual is relative to the faith of the Church" (page 142).

". . . to hold this, some men would say, is equivalent to denying its objective character. But they would say this in their haste; because it had not fallen in their way to study metaphysics . . ." (page 150).

"Metaphysical study makes us conscious how much the mind (the perceptive or intellectual faculties in us as distinct from the moral or spiritual) has to do with actually constituting the objects of the outward world—the trees, the animals, the persons. Mind, as it is in me and in all men, not only perceives these things as ready-made, but also has to do with making them to be. God we commonly say, creates things in nature, and He creates mind. But in fact the two creations are inseparable. The things have no existence apart from the minds which know them, for it is only as held together by the mind of the observer that all the sensations of colour, taste, hardness, softness, shape, etc., coalesce into an object held together in relations to the whole orderly world. Relations are the work of the mind, and relations are necessary to make objects. On the other hand, it is only the sensations given from outside which enable the mind to perceive and know, and so to become a mind at all" (pages 150-151).

"And we observe that this doctrine of relativity

makes the reality of objects, neither in the sphere of nature nor of the spiritual world, to depend upon the precarious state of mind of any individual. The trees and flowers do not depend on my mind for their existence, but on the action of that common reason in which all men more or less effectively share . . . so the spiritual presence of Christ in His Body and His Blood (and all that goes with it) rests not on the precarious faith of any individual, but is relative to the faith of the Church as a whole . . ." (pages 152-153).

Bishop Gore rightly rejects Transubstantiation, though chiefly on the ground that "it is truly contrary to a fundamental Christian philosophy" (page 120). Is it not passing strange then, that he should set forth his own doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence, by a philosophy which strikes at the very root of all Theism? Have we not already learnt from experience what is the logical outcome of Hegelianism? And has not "the common reason" rejected it as full of assumptions and fallacies?

THE END.

Printed by Curtis & Beamish, Ltd., Coventry.

265.0239
Lye, Arthur Leigh -
L533
Faith & Sacrament

265.0239
L98